



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

This thesis has been submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree (e.g. PhD, MPhil, DClinPsychol) at the University of Edinburgh. Please note the following terms and conditions of use:

This work is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, which are retained by the thesis author, unless otherwise stated.

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge.

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author.

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author.

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given.

Divine Anger, Divine Holiness and the Exclusion of Moses
in Numbers and Deuteronomy

Kin Foon MAN

Doctor of Philosophy
The University of Edinburgh
2017

Abstract

This dissertation investigates the exclusion of Moses from the Promised Land in Numbers and Deuteronomy. Why are there different reasons given for his exclusion in the two books? Can they be explained by the complex redactions of Deuteronomy? There are four different answers to the question of Moses' exclusion. According to Deut 1-3, divine anger is directed at Moses because he is the leader of the first exodus generation on whom the wrath of God is visited. Moses is excluded because he should bear the same punishment as the first generation of Israelites who left Egypt. Another reason is given in Deut 4, a mixture of late layers in the Deuteronomistic History. Accordingly, Moses' exclusion is compared to the destruction and scattering of the future generations of the Israelites who provoked God to anger. The "anger-punishment pattern" of Moses' exclusion, which is a theme of divine anger in the Deuteronomistic History, is used to confess the sin of the Israelites. Thirdly, in the post-Priestly passages in Numbers and Deuteronomy, Moses is ordered to die because of the sin of failing to sanctify YHWH. The exclusion of Moses is a natural consequence of his death outside the Promised Land. Finally, Deut 31 and 34 imply that Moses has reached the limit of life span which was set by YHWH.

Lay Summary

This dissertation investigates the question of why Moses was not allowed to enter the Land of cis-Jordan in Numbers and Deuteronomy. Why are there different reasons given for his exclusion in these two books? Can they be explained by the different editions of Deuteronomy? There are four different answers to the question of Moses' exclusion from the Land of Canaan. According to the first three chapters of Deuteronomy, divine anger is directed at Moses because he is the leader of the Israelites on whom the wrath of God is visited. Moses is excluded because he should bear the same punishment as the people who left Egypt. Another reason is given in Deut 4. Accordingly, the death and exclusion of Moses is compared to the destruction and diaspora of the future generations of the Israelites who provoked God to anger. The "anger-punishment pattern" of Moses' exclusion, which is a theme of divine anger in Deuteronomy-Kings, is used to confess the sin of the Israelites. Thirdly, according to Num 20, 27 and Deut 32, Moses is ordered to die because of the sin of failing to regard God as holy. He should be punished by the death penalty. The exclusion of Moses is a natural consequence of his death outside the Land of Palestine. Finally, the end of Deuteronomy implies that Moses has reached the limit of life span which was set by God.

Declaration

I, Kin Foon MAN, declare that this thesis has been composed by me and that it has not been submitted for any other degree or professional qualification.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading 'KfMan' in a stylized, cursive script.

Kin Foon MAN

Word count: 94, 865 words.

Contents

Abbreviations	9
Chapter One. The Two Versions of the Exclusion of Moses	13
Chapter Two. The Diachronic Order of the Texts	51
Chapter Three. Review of Scholarship	123
Chapter Four. Divine Anger on Moses in Deut 1-3	175
Chapter Five. The “Anger-Punishment Pattern” in Deut 4	237
Chapter Six. The Sin of Moses in Num 20 and Num 27	263
Chapter Seven. Moses’ Failure to Sanctify God in Deut 32	299
Chapter Eight. The Death of Moses in Deut 31 and Deut 34	319
Chapter Nine. Conclusion	331
Bibliography	339

Abbreviations

AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	<i>Anchor Bible Dictionary</i> . Edited by D. N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992
ABOTC	Abingdon Old Testament Commentaries
AOTC	Apollos Old Testament Commentary
<i>AJT</i>	<i>Asia Journal of Theology</i>
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
AOTC	Apollos Old Testament Commentary
AnBib	Analecta Biblica
ATD	Das Alte Testament Deutsch
AThANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
ATM	Altes Testament und Moderne
AYBRL	The Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library
BCE	Before Common Era
BEATAJ	Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des Antiken Judentums
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
<i>BHQ</i>	<i>Biblia Hebraica Quinta</i>
<i>BHS</i>	<i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i>
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
BIS	Biblical Interpretation Series
BJRL	Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies
BKAT	Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament
<i>BN</i>	<i>Biblische Notizen</i>
<i>BR</i>	<i>Bible Review</i>
BTS	Biblisch-Theologische Studien
BWAT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten Testament
BZAR	Beihefte der Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte
CAT	Commentaire de L'Ancien Testament
CB	The Century Bible
CBC	The Cambridge Bible Commentary
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>The Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBQMS	The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CBSC	The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges
CE	Common Era
D	Deuteronomistic source
<i>DBH</i>	<i>Dictionary of the Bible</i> . Edited by J. Hastings. 5 vols. New York: C. Scribner's sons, 1898-1904
<i>DBT</i>	<i>Dictionary of Biblical Theology</i> . Edited by Xavier Léon-Dufour. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1973
<i>DCH</i>	<i>The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew</i> . Edited by David Clines. 8 vols. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993-2011
DtrH	The Deuteronomistic History

E	Elohish source
EBR	<i>Encyclopedia of the Bible and its Reception</i> . Edited by Has-Josef Klauck. Berlin: de Gruyter: 2009-
ECT	<i>Encyclopedia of Christian Theology</i> . Edited by Jean-Yves Lacoste. 3 vols. London: Routledge, 2005
EDSS	<i>Encyclopedia of Dead Sea Scroll</i> . Edited by L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000
EncBib	<i>Encyclopedia Biblica</i> . Edited by T. K. Cheyne and J. S. Black. 4 vols. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1899-1903
EncBrit	<i>Encyclopedia Britannica</i>
EncChr	<i>The Encyclopedia of Christianity</i> . Edited by E. Fahlbusch et al 5 vols. Grand Rapids, Mich.; Leiden: William B. Eerdmans; Brill, 1999-2005
ERE	<i>Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics</i> . Edited by J. Hastings. 13 vols. New York: Scribner, 1908-26.
ET	English Translation
ETL	<i>Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses</i>
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
FOTL	Form of the Old Testament Literature
H	Holiness code
HALOT	<i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Edited by L. Koehler et al. Study Edition. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2001
HAT	Handbuch zum Alten Testament
HeBAI	<i>Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel</i>
HKAT	Handkommentar zum Alten Testament
HTKAT	Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
IB	<i>The Interpreter's Bible</i>
IBHS	<i>An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax</i> . Bruce K. Waltke and M. O'Connor. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1990
ICC	The International Critical Commentary
IDB	<i>The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible</i> . Edited by G. A. Buttrick. 4 vols. Nashville: Abingdon, 1962
IDBSup	<i>The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible: Supplementary Volume</i> . Edited by K. Crim. Nashville: Abingdon, 1976
Int	<i>Interpretation</i>
ITC	International Theological Commentary
J	Yahwist source
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JHS	<i>Journal of Hebrew Scriptures</i>
JPS	Jewish Publication Society
JPSTC	The Jewish Publication Society Torah Commentary
JSOT	<i>Journal for the Study of Old Testament</i>
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of Old Testament Supplement Series
KAT	Kommentar zum Alten Testament
KHCAT	Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament
LBC	Layman's Bible Commentaries
LXX	Septuagint Greek

MT	Masoretic Text
NCBC	The New Century Bible Commentary
NEB	Neue Echter Bibel
NIBC	New International Biblical Commentary
NICOT	New International Commentary of the Old Testament
<i>NIDB</i>	<i>New Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible</i> . Edited by Abingdon Press. 5 vols. Nashville: Abingdon, 2006-2009
<i>NIDOTTE</i>	<i>New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology & Exegesis</i> . Edited by Willem A. VanGemeren. 5 vols. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 1997
NIVAC	New International Version Application Commentary
<i>NRTh</i>	<i>Nouvelle Revue Théologique</i>
OBC	Oxford Bible Commentary
OBO	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis
ÖBS	Österreichische Biblische Studien
OBT	Overtures to Biblical Theology
<i>OEB</i>	<i>The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Books of the Bible</i> . Edited by Michael D. Coogan. 2 vols. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011
<i>OEBT</i>	<i>The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Bible and Theology</i> . Edited by Samuel E. Balentine. 2 vols. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2015
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTS	Old Testament Studies
OtTS	Oudtestamentische Studien
P	Priestly source/writing
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue Biblique</i>
<i>RPP</i>	<i>Religion Past and Present: Encyclopedia of Theology and Religion</i> . Edited by Hans Dieter Betz. 14 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2007-2013
SB	Sources Bibliques
SBAB	Stuttgarter Biblische Aufsatzbände
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLSymS	Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series
SBTS	Sources for Biblical and Theological Study
SCS	Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SOTSMS	Society for Old Testament Studies Monograph Series
SP	Samaritan Pentateuch
Syr	Syriac
<i>TDOT</i>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</i> . Edited by G. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1974-
<i>TDNT</i>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. 10 vols. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1964-76
Tg	Targum
<i>TLOT</i>	<i>Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Edited by E. Jenni and C. Westermann. 3 vols. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1997

TOTC	Tyndale Old Testament Commentary
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Vetus Testamentum Supplements
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
<i>ZABR</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte</i>
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZBAT	Zürcher Bibelkommentare Altes Testament
<i>ZThK</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>

Chapter One. The Two Versions of the Exclusion of Moses

1. The different versions of the exclusion of Moses in Numbers and

Deuteronomy

This dissertation is a critical study of the exclusion of Moses¹ as recorded in Numbers and Deuteronomy. Why was Moses forbidden to enter the Land of Canaan? In Deuteronomy, there are six passages about the exclusion of Moses from entering the Promised Land (Deut 1:37; 3:26-27; 4:21; 31:2; 32:51-52; 34:4).

Deut 1:37 is in the context of Deut 1:34-39, a saying of Moses:

Deut 1:34-39 (MT)	English Translation
34 וישמע יהוה את קול דבריכם	When YHWH heard the voice of your words,
ויקצף וישבע לאמר	He was angry and swore, saying,
35 אם יראה איש באנשים האלה	“Not one of these men shall see,
הדור הרע הזה	this evil generation, ²
את הארץ הטובה	the good land ³

¹ Throughout this study, the term “exclusion of Moses” will refer to that Moses could not enter the Promised Land or he could not cross over the river of Jordan. This study will not be concerned with the historicity of Moses or with the motif of the death of Moses. That motif is related to the exclusion of Moses, but it is not the focus of this study.

² In MT אנשים האלה (“these men”) is followed by the appositive הדור הרע הזה (“this evil generation”) which LXX omits. McCarthy believes that the expression “this evil generation” is used to clarify that “these men” refers not just to the spies, but to the wider group, and so this clarification interrupts the flow of the sentence. See Carmel McCarthy, *Biblia Hebraica Quinta 5: Deuteronomy* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007), 53*. Wevers thinks that the omission improves the text. See John William Wevers, *Notes on the Greek text of Deuteronomy* (SCS 39; Atlanta, Geo.: Scholars Press, 1995), 21.

³ Here, MT has the phrase הארץ הטובה (“the good land”), but LXX translates as τῇ ἀγαθῇ γῇ (“this good land”), including the demonstrative pronoun ταύτην. The fuller phrase הארץ הטובה הזאת (“this good land”) occurs twice in MT in Deuteronomy (Deut 4:22b; 9:6), and is rendered accordingly by LXX and SP. See McCarthy, *Deuteronomy*, 53*-54*.

אשר נשבעתי לתת לאבותיכם	which I swore to give ⁴ to your fathers, ⁵
36 זולתי כלב בן יפנה	except ⁶ Caleb the son of Jephunneh
הוא יראנה	he shall see it,
ולו אתן את הארץ	and to him I will give the land
אשר דרך בה	on which he stepped,
ולבני	and to his sons,
יען אשר מלא אחרי יהוה	because he has followed YHWH fully.” ⁷
37 גם בי התאנק יהוה בגללכם לאמר	YHWH was angry with me also on your account, saying,
גם אתה לא תבא שם	“Even you shall not enter there.
38 יהושע בן נון	Joshua son of Nun,
העמד לפניך	who stands before you,
הוא יבא שמה	he shall enter there.
אתו חזק	Encourage ⁸ him,
כי הוא ינחלנה את ישראל	for he will cause Israel to inherit it.
39 וטפכם	And your little ones

⁴ LXX, SP and Vulgate omit the לתת (“to give”) of MT. Nelson suggests that the omission is used to correct the implication that the land had already been given to the patriarchs. See Richard D. Nelson, *Deuteronomy: A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville, Kent.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002), 23. McCarthy thinks that here the shorter text may well be preferable because MT would be a secondary harmonisation with Josh 21:43. However, it is also possible that the shorter text is assimilation to Deut 6:18. See McCarthy, *Deuteronomy*, 54*.

⁵ LXX, Syr and Tg read third person plural: “their fathers.” Duane L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 1-11* (WBC 6A; Dallas, Tex.: Word Books, 1991), 27.

⁶ זולתי (“except, only”) is a conjunction which occurs only twice in the Pentateuch. Here it is rendered by *παρὰ* in LXX. Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 21.

⁷ LXX translates יהוה מלא אחרי (“has fully followed YHWH”) as *τὸ προσκεῖσθαι αὐτὸν τὰ πρὸς κύριον* (“his adherence to matters concerning the Lord”). Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 22.

⁸ SP appears to have changed the Piel imperative of חזק of MT to Hiphil imperative קחצי(י). McCarthy, *Deuteronomy*, 54*.

אשר אמרתם לבז יהיה	whom you said would become booty, ⁹
ובניכם	and your sons,
אשר לא ידעו היום טוב ורע	who today do not know good or evil,
המה יבאו שמה	they will enter there,
וליהם אתננה	and to them I will give it,
והם יירשוה	and they will possess it.
40 ואתם פנו לכם	But you, turn for yourselves ¹⁰
וסעו המדברה דרך ים סוף	and march to the wilderness by the way of the Reed Sea.”

Deut 3:26-27 belongs to the context of Deut 3:23-28:

Deut 3:23-28 (MT)	English Translation
23 ואתחנן אל יהוה בעת ההוא	And I pleaded with YHWH at that time,
לאמר	saying,
24 אדני יהוה	“O Lord YHWH,
אתה החלית להראות את עבדך	you have begun to show your servant ¹¹

⁹ McCarthy points out that MT contains a main statement prefaced by two nominative absolutes (בניכם and טפכם), each of which is further clarified by a relative clause beginning with אשר. However, the first of these clauses is absent in LXX, while the second is absent in SP. McCarthy, *Deuteronomy*, 54*-55*. According to Lohfink, the first clause was a late expansion taken from Num 14:31. SP testifies to this harmonising addition, but LXX at this point represents a stage in the history of the text when it had not yet taken place. The absence of the second relative clause from SP can be interpreted as testifying to an earlier stage of the text. MT may represent a family of manuscripts that has combined both additions in the form of a conflation. See Norbert Lohfink, “Canonical Signals in the Additions in Deuteronomy 1.39,” in *Seeing Signals, Reading Signs: The Art of Exegesis. Studies in Honour of Antony F. Campbell, SJ for his Seventieth Birthday* (eds. Mark A. O’Brien and H. N. Wallace; JSOTSup 415; London: T&T Clark, 2004), 30-43. Nelson agrees that the first relative clause may be a harmonising expansion from Num 14:31. However, he thinks that the second relative clause is not an expansion because there is no obvious source for such a clause. See Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 23. Wevers suggests that the LXX translator includes טפכם as well as בניכם under the umbrella term καὶ πᾶν παιδίον νέον ὅστις οὐκ οἶδεν σήμερον ἀγαθὸν ἢ κακόν “and every young child who now does not know good or evil” by adding πᾶν (“every, all”) See Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 23.

¹⁰ The expression פנו לכם וסעו (“turn for yourselves and march”), in which “for yourselves” follows the first verb, occurs only here in the Hebrew Bible. But in Num 14:25 and Deut 1:7 the “for yourselves” comes after the second verb: פנו וסעו לכם. SP reads this latter form in all three places. McCarthy, *Deuteronomy*, 55*. LXX and Vulgate omit לכם (“for yourselves”). See Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 23.

¹¹ The term עבד (“servant”) occurs only 22 times in Deuteronomy and is translated in LXX eight times each by παῖς and οἰκέτης, and once each by δοῦλος and υἱός. Here it is translated as θεράπων which is favoured by the Exodus LXX translator. See Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 63.

את גדלך ואת ירך החזקה	your greatness and your mighty hand; ¹²
אשר מי אל בשמים ובארץ	for what god is there in heaven or on earth
אשר יעשה כמעשיך וכגבורתך	who can do as your works and as your mighty acts? ¹³
25 אעברה נא ואראה את הארץ הטובה	Let me cross over and see the good land
אשר בעבר הירדן	that is beyond the Jordan,
ההר הטוב הזה והלבנון	that good hill country and Lebanon.”
26 ויתעבר יהוה בי למענכם	But YHWH was furious ¹⁴ with me for your sake,
ולא שמע אלי	and did not listen to me,
ויאמר יהוה אלי	and YHWH said to me,
רב לך	“ It is enough for you.
אל תוסף דבר אלי עוד בדבר הזה	Do not continue to speak to me of this matter again.
27 עלה ראש הפסגה	Go up to ¹⁵ the top of Pisgah ¹⁶

¹² In LXX there are four nominals: τὴν ἰσχύ σου καὶ τὴν δυνάμιν σου καὶ τὴν χεῖρα τὴν κραταίαν καὶ τὸν βραχίονα τὸν ὑψηλόν. The first two are a doublet rendering for **את גדלך** (“your greatness”). The LXX translator may have felt the need to interpret “greatness” as including both strength and power. For the latter two MT has only **ואת ירך החזקה** (“and your mighty hand”). The fuller expression “a mighty hand and an outstretched arm” occurs at Deut 4:34; 5:15; 7:19; 11:2 and 26:8, with some slight variations. In MT of Deut 3:24; 6:21; 7:8; 9:26 and 34:12, the expression contains only the first half, “a mighty hand.” See McCarthy, *Deuteronomy*, 60*. Here, in Deut 3:24, LXX gives the fuller expression, and does not reproduce the pronominal suffixes. See Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 63. Syr also adds “and your outstretched arm” as LXX. See Christensen, *Deuteronomy 1-11*, 65.

¹³ In MT the two are both prepositional phrases, **כמעשיך וכגבורתך** (“as your works and as your mighty acts”). LXX translates the first one by καθὰ σὺ ἐποίησας, and the second one literally by καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἰσχύ σου. See Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 63.

¹⁴ The Hebrew verb **ויתעבר** is usually understood as derived from a root meaning “be carried away by passion,” thus here, “be infuriated with,” that is, YHWH was furious with Moses. But LXX considers the more common root meaning “to pass by,” and translates as ὑπερεῖδεν (“disregarded”) which is contextually sensible as well. See Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 64.

¹⁵ MT has no preposition. 4QDeut^d and LXX read **על** and ἐπὶ (“unto”) respectively. Nelson believes that it is probably caused by a dittography of **עלה** (“go up”). This preposition became **אל** in SP. See Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 51. However, McCarthy thinks that the *Vorlage* of LXX may contain either **אל** or **על**. The twenty-four occurrences of the Qal form of **עלה** in Deuteronomy are consistently rendered with the verb ἀναβαίνω in LXX, with variations in the preposition used (or not used) according to the different contexts. In the three occurrences (Deut 10:1; 17:8 and 34:1) where MT follows the verb with the preposition, LXX used πρὸς, εἰς, and ἐπὶ respectively, while in the unique occurrence of **עלה** followed by **על** (Deut 28:43), LXX uses ἐπὶ. Here, in Deut 3:27, the inclusion of ἐπὶ in LXX would suggest the presence of either **אל** or **על** in its *Vorlage*. See McCarthy, *Deuteronomy*, 60*.

¹⁶ In MT the place name “Pisgah” is present, while in LXX **הפסגה** is translated by Λελαξευμένου. It is not clear why the mountain name is translated by a perfect passive participle of λαξεύω. Perhaps it is inspired by the physical appearance of the mountain which looked as though it were carved in stone, thus a stony mountain. See Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 64; McCarthy, *Deuteronomy*, 60-61*.

ושא עיניך	and lift up your eyes ¹⁷
ימה וצפנה ותימנה ומזרחה	to the west and north and south and east,
וראה בעיניך	and see with your eyes,
כי לא תעבר את הירדן הזה	for you shall not cross over this Jordan.
28 וצו את יהושע	And charge Joshua
וחזקהו ואמצהו	and encourage him and strengthen him, ¹⁸
כי הוא יעבר לפני העם הזה	for he shall cross before this people,
והוא ינחיל אותם את הארץ	and he will give them as an inheritance the land
אשר תראה	which you will see.”

Deut 4:21-22, with its context:

Deut 4:21-28 (MT)	English Translation
21 ויהוה התאנף בי על דבריכם	Now YHWH was angry with me because of your words, ¹⁹
וישב	and swore ²⁰
לבלתי עברי את הירדן	(that) I would not cross the Jordan, ²¹
ולבלתי בא אל הארץ הטובה	and I would not enter the good land ²²
אשר יהוה אלהיך נתן לך נחלה	which YHWH your God ²³ is giving you as an inheritance.
22 כי אנכי מת בארץ הזאת	For I will die in this land,
אינני עבר את הירדן	I shall not cross the Jordan,
ואתם עברים	but you shall cross

¹⁷ The occasional omission of a possessive pronoun in LXX for a corresponding Hebrew suffix is a characteristic of LXX which occurs with reasonable frequency, particularly in relation to parts of the body. See McCarthy, *Deuteronomy*, 61*.

¹⁸ MT contains two imperatives וחזקהו ואמצהו which both mean “strengthen, make strong.” LXX has distinguished the two by κατίσχυσον αὐτόν καὶ παρακάλεσον αὐτόν (“strengthen him and encourage him”) which also fits the context. See Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 65.

¹⁹ Wevers thinks that LXX amplifies the phrase על דבריכם as περὶ τῶν λεγομένων ὑφ’ ὑμῶν (“because of the words being said by you”), a direct reference to the people’s murmuring at Deut 1:27-28. Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 78.

²⁰ SP and some Hebrew manuscripts omit וישב.

²¹ LXX adds a demonstrative pronoun τοῦτον after τὸν Ἰορδάνην over against MT here as well as in verse 22. Wevers suggests that this may be due to the influence of Deut 3:27 where MT has הזה את הירדן (“this Jordan”). Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 78.

²² LXX differs from MT’s designation of the land as הארץ הטובה (“the good land”) in its τῇ γῇ. Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 78.

²³ LXX reads ὁ θεός which does not render the suffix אלהיך. The collocation יהוה אלהיך occurs 193 times in Deuteronomy and only five times does LXX have only κύριος ὁ θεός (also at Deut 19:2, 8; 21:5; 24:9), which does not render the suffix. See Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 78.

וירשתם את הארץ הטובה הזאת	and take possession of this good land.
23 השמרו לכם	So keep yourselves,
פן תשכחו את ברית יהוה אלהיכם	that you do not forget the covenant of YHWH your God
אשר כרת עמכם	which he made with you,
ועשיתם לכם פסל תמונת כל	and make for yourselves a graven image in the form of anything
אשר צוה יהוה אלהיך	which YHWH your God has commanded you.
24 כי יהוה אלהיך אש אכלה	For YHWH your God is a consuming fire,
הוא אל קנא	He is a jealous El.
25 כי תוליד בנים ובני בנים	When ²⁴ you bear sons and sons' sons ²⁵
ונושנתם בארץ	and have remained long ²⁶ in the land,
והשחתם	and act corruptly,
ועשיתם פסל תמונת כל	and make an idol in the form of anything,
ועשיתם הרע בעיני יהוה אלהיך	and do the evil in the eyes of YHWH your God
להכעיסו	to provoke him to anger
26 העידתי בכם היום את השמים ואת הארץ	I call the heaven and the earth to witness against you today,
כי אבד תאבדון מהר מעל הארץ	that you will surely perish quickly ²⁷ from the land
אשר אתם עברים	where you are going over
את הירדן שמה לרשתה	the Jordan to possess it.
לא תאריך ימים עליה	You shall not lengthen days ²⁸ on it,

²⁴ LXX renders the כי clause as a conditional ἐάν type. Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 80.

²⁵ LXX adds a possessive pronoun to בני בנים by rendering as υἱοὺς τῶν υἱῶν σου (“your sons’ sons”). Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 80.

²⁶ Wevers thinks that the choice of χρονίσῃτε in LXX to render נושנתם is peculiar, because it simply means “to spend time,” but the Hebrew means “to grow old.” See Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 80.

²⁷ LXX disregards the adverb מהר (“quickly”) in MT. Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 81. Of the eight occurrences of the adverbial use of מהר in Deuteronomy, there are two other instances (Deut 9:3, 16) where it is omitted in a significant part of the Greek textual tradition. McCarthy thinks that the reasons for these omissions are puzzling. See McCarthy, *Deuteronomy*, 63*. Nelson suggests that the omission in here may be either as a correction because the perishing took some time or due to homoiarchton of מהר to מעל. See Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 60.

²⁸ LXX has created a neologism πολυχρόνιετε based on the adjective πολυχρόνιος for the Hebrew לא תאריך ימים (“you shall not lengthen days”). Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 82.

כי השמר תשמדון	but will be utterly destroyed.
27 והפיץ יהוה אתכם בעמים	YHWH will scatter you among the peoples, ²⁹
ונשארתי מתי מספר בגוים	and you will be left few in number among the nations
אשר ינהג יהוה אתכם שמה	where YHWH drives you. ³⁰
28 ועבדתם שם אלהים	There you will serve gods, ³¹
מעשה ידי אדם עץ ואבן	the work of man's hands, wood and stone,
אשר לא יראו ולא ישמעו	which neither see nor hear
ולא יאכלו ולא יריחו	nor eat nor smell.

²⁹ LXX has ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (“among all the nations”), MT does not have an equivalent for πᾶσι, but it is supported by Vulgate. Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 82.

³⁰ The verb in the relative clause in MT is ינהג (“he drives”), LXX softens the active force of the verb by using ἐλσάξει (“will bring you in”). See Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 82.

³¹ LXX translates אלהים by θεοὶς ἑτέροις (“other gods”). Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 82. Syr also expands to “other gods.” Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 60. In Targum Onkelos to the Pentateuch, a phrase “the people, worshippers of idols” is added to insist that it was the nations, not the idols, that the Israelites served in exile. See McCarthy, *Deuteronomy*, 63*.

Deut 31:2 is in the context of Deut 31:1-6:

Deut 31:1-6 (MT)	English Translation
1 וילך משה	And Moses went ³²
וידבר את הדברים האלה	and spoke these words ³³
אל כל ישראל	to all Israel. ³⁴
2 ויאמר אליהם	And he said to them,
בן מאה ועשרים שנה אנכי היום	“I am a hundred and twenty years old today,
לא אוכל עוד לצאת ולבוא	I am no longer able to go out and to come in, ³⁵
ויהוה אמר אלי	and YHWH has said to me,
לא תעבר את הירדן הזה	‘You will not cross over this Jordan.’

³² There are textual differences between MT, 1QDeut^b (Fragment 13ii) and LXX in Deut 31:1.

LXX	1QDeut ^b Frag.13ii	MT Deut 31:1
καὶ συνετέλεσεν Μωυσῆς	ויכל משה	וילך משה
λαλῶν πάντας ...	לדבר את כל ...	וידבר את ...
Eng. translation of LXX	Eng. translation of 1QDeut ^b Frag.13ii	Eng. translation of MT Deut 31:1
And Moses <i>finished</i> speaking all ...	And Moses <i>finished</i> speaking all ...	And Moses <i>went</i> and spoke ...

The textual differences involve the transposition of two consonants (כ and ל), forming וילך (“and he went”) in MT and ויכל (“and he finished”) 1QDeut^b Frag.13ii, in which we also find כל (“all”), and לדבר (“speaking”) rather than וידבר (“and he spoke”). The MT reading “and he went and spoke” means “and he began to say.” It can be used to introduce a new discourse which follows Deut 31:1. On the contrary, the reading “and Moses finished speaking all these words...” in the Qumran and LXX means that the sayings before Deut 31:1 are completed and finished. See Cécile Dogniez and Marguerite Harl, *La Bible D’Alexandrie: Le Deutéronome* (Paris: Cerf, 1992), 312; Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 490. There are opinions that LXX and 1QDeut^b do preserve the better reading of the two, for instance, Mayes thinks that a deliberate change from the MT to the text presupposed by LXX and offered by the Dead Sea Scrolls is less credible than a deliberate change in the other direction. See A. D. H. Mayes, *Deuteronomy* (NCBC; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1979), 372-3. In addition, Levinson suggests that the reading of 1QDeut^b “may make more sense since it creates an exact parallel” between this verse and Deut 32:45, each of which marks a transition between two sections of text, and is continued by (“and he said to them...”) (Deut 31:2; 32:46). See Bernard M. Levinson, “Deuteronomy,” in *The Jewish Study Bible* (ed. A. Berlin and M. Z. Brettler; 2d ed; New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 416. However, according to the principle of *Difficilior lectio potior* (“the more difficult reading is preferable”), the MT reading, which is more difficult, is preferable. Thus, both the readings “and he went” and “and he finished” may be possible. For more discussion of this issue, see McCarthy, *Deuteronomy*, 134*.

³³ LXX has πάντας τοὺς λόγους τούτους (“all these words”).

³⁴ LXX reads υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ (“children of Israel”).

³⁵ LXX gives a different order of the two infinitives: εἰσπορεύεσθαι καὶ ἐκπορεύεσθαι (“to come in and go out”).

3 יהוה אלהיך הוא עבר לפניך	YHWH your God Himself will cross over ³⁶ before you.
הוא ישמיד	He will destroy
את הגוים האלה מלפניך	these nations before you,
וירשתם	and you will possess them.
יהושע הוא עבר לפניך	Joshua, ³⁷ he will cross over before you,
כאשר דבר יהוה	as YHWH has spoken.
4 ועשה יהוה להם	YHWH will do to them
כאשר עשה לסיחון ולעוג	as he did to Sihon and Og,
מלכי האמרי	the kings ³⁸ of the Amorites,
ולארצם	and to their land,
אשר השמיד אתם	whom ³⁹ He destroyed them.
5 ונתנם יהוה לפניכם	YHWH will give ⁴⁰ them over to you,
ועשיתם להם	and you will do to them
ככל המצוה	according to all the commands ⁴¹
אשר צויתי אתכם	which I have commanded you.
6 חזקו ואמצו	Be strong and courageous,
אל תיראו	do not fear
ואל תערצו מפניהם	and do not tremble ⁴² because of them,
כי יהוה אלהיך הוא ההלך עמך	for YHWH your God He goes with you. ⁴³
לא ירפך	He will not fail you
ולא יעזבך	and will not forsake you.”

³⁶ MT has **הוא עבר**, while SP has **הוא העבר**, and LXX has an article before the participle: ὁ προπορευόμενος (who goes). McCarthy thinks that MT is more likely to be the *lectio difficilior* here, while SP could be seen to assimilate to both Deut 9:3 and the quasi-parallels of Deut 31:6, 8. See McCarthy, *Deuteronomy*, 135*.

³⁷ In MT this part of the verse is asyndetic, but LXX renders smoothly by καὶ Ἰησοῦς (“And Iesous”). See Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 491.

³⁸ LXX has τοῖς δυσὶ βασιλεῦσιν (“the two kings”).

³⁹ LXX gives a καθότι clause “even as he destroyed them,” which is exegetical in nature. Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 491.

⁴⁰ LXX has an aorist παρέδωκεν (“he has delivered”), while MT has **ונתנם** (“and he will deliver them”).

⁴¹ LXX has a shorter reading and does not have “all the commands.” MT may be a secondarily expanded reading. McCarthy, *Deuteronomy*, 135*.

⁴² MT has only two negative commands, but LXX has three: μὴ φοβοῦ μηδὲ δειλιά μηδὲ πτοηθῇς (“fear not, neither be frightened, neither be terrified”). It is not clear that which one renders **ואל תערצו**. Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 492.

⁴³ LXX has μεθ’ ὑμῶν ἐν ὑμῖν (“with you among you”). Possibly the ἐν ὑμῖν was added to show that, though YHWH was going with you, He was at the same time among you, in your midst. Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 493.

Deut 32:51-52 with its context:

Deut 32:48-52 (MT)	English Translation
48 וידבר יהוה אל משה	And YHWH spoke to Moses
בעצם היום הזה לאמר	on the same day, saying,
49 עלה אל הר העברים הזה	“Ascend this mountain of the Abarim,
הר נבו	Mount Nebo, ⁴⁴
אשר בארץ מואב	which is in the land of Moab
אשר על פני ירחו	which is across Jericho,
וראה את ארץ כנען	and see the land of Canaan,
אשר אני נתן לבני ישראל	which I, I am giving to the Israelites
לאחזה	for a possession.
50 ומת בהר	And die on the mountain
אשר אתה עלה שמה	that you ascend there,
והאסף אל עמך	and be gathered to your people, ⁴⁵
כאשר מת אהרן אחיך	as Aaron your brother died
בהר ההר	on Mount Hor
ויאסף אל עמיו	and was gathered to his people, ⁴⁶
51 על אשר מעלתם בי	because you broke faith with me ⁴⁷
בתוך בני ישראל	in the midst of the Israelites
במי מריבת קדש	at the waters of Meribath Kadesh, ⁴⁸
מדבר צן	(in) the wilderness of Zin,
על אשר	because
לא קדשתם אותי	you did not regard me as holy
בתוך בני ישראל	in the midst of the Israelites.

⁴⁴ MT has נבו (“Nebo”); SP reads נבא; LXX reads Ναβαυ.

⁴⁵ SP reads עמך (“your people,” singular) rather than עמך (“your people,” plural). LXX has λαόν σου (“your people,” singular). Syr and Tg also have a singular reading. The idiom “to be gathered unto one’s people” occurs ten times in the Pentateuch (Gen 25:8, 17; 35:29; 49:29. 33; Num 20:24; 27:13; 31:2; Deut 32:50[2×]). In nine of these occurrence, MT attests a plural noun [עמך or עמיו], and only once as a singular form (Gen 49:29, in which Jacob, who is about to die, is the speaker). By contrast, SP usually writes a singular noun. See McCarthy, *Deuteronomy*, 154*.

⁴⁶ SP reads עמיו (“his people,” singular) rather than the plural in MT: עמיו. LXX has λαὸν αὐτοῦ (“his people,” singular). Syr and Tg also have a singular reading.

⁴⁷ MT makes this an act of rebellion, but LXX translates as ἠπειθήσατε τῷ ῥήματί μου (“you disobeyed my word”). LXX softens the direct rebellion against YHWH by interpreting בי (“against me”) by τῷ ῥήματί μου. See McCarthy, *Deuteronomy*, 154*; Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 537.

⁴⁸ LXX translate as τοῦ ὕδατος ἀντιλογίας Καδης (“the waters of dispute at Kadesh”), it seems that the translator did not understand מי מריבת (“waters of Meribath”) as a place name. See Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 537.

52 כי מנגד תראה את הארץ	For you may see the land at a distance,
ושמה לא תבוא	and there you shall not enter,
אל הארץ	into the land
אשר אני נתן	which I am giving
לבני ישראל	to the Israelites.”

Deut 34:4-5 with its narrative context:

Deut 34:1-6 (MT)	English Translation
1 ויעל משה מערבת מואב	And Moses ascended from the plains of Moab
אל הר נבו ראש הפסגה	to Mount Nebo, to the top of Pisgah,
אשר על פני ירחו	which is opposite Jericho.
ויראהו יהוה את כל הארץ	And YHWH showed him all the land,
את הגלעד עד דן ⁴⁹	Gilead as far as Dan, ⁴⁹
2 ואת כל נפתלי	and all Naphtali ⁵⁰
ואת ארץ אפרים	and the land of Ephraim
ומנשה	and Manasseh,
ואת כל ארץ יהודה	and all the land of Judah
עד הים האחרון	as far as the Western Sea,
3 ואת הנגב	and the Negev ⁵¹
ואת הככר בקעת ירחו	and the region in the valley of Jericho, ⁵²
עיר התמרים	the city of palm trees,
עד צער	as far as Zoar.
4 ויאמר יהוה אליו	Then YHWH said to him, ⁵³
זאת הארץ	“This is the land

⁴⁹ The text of SP for Deut 34:1-3 is considerably shorter than MT. According to SP, the land shown to Moses is described in very general terms as extending “from the river of Egypt to the great river, the river Euphrates, and as far as the Western Sea.” SP omits most of verse 2, apart from “as far as the Western Sea.” For a discussion of the motives for SP’s description, see McCarthy, *Deuteronomy*, 168*.

⁵⁰ LXX reads πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν Νεφθαλί (“all the land of Nephthali”). MT does not have “the land.”

⁵¹ LXX translates הנגב (“Negev”) to τὴν ἔρημον (“the desert”) because the Negev is the desert of south Judah. See Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 558.

⁵² MT identifies הככר as the בקעת ירחו, while LXX disregarded בקעת entirely, it only has τὰ περίχωρα Ιεριχώ (“the environs of Jericho”). Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 558.

⁵³ MT uses a pronoun (“him”) for Moses, but LXX has Μωσῆν (“Moses”).

אשר נשבעתי	of which I swore
לאברהם ליצחק וליעקב	to Abraham, to Isaac, ⁵⁴ and to Jacob,
לאמר	saying,
לזרעך אתננה	‘I will give it to your ⁵⁵ descendants;’
הראיתך בעיניך	I have made you see ⁵⁶ with your eyes,
ושמה לא תעבר	but you will not cross over ⁵⁷ there.”
5 וימת שם משה עבד יהוה	So Moses the servant of YHWH died there
בארץ מואב	in the land of Moab,
על פי יהוה	according to the word of YHWH. ⁵⁸
6 ויקבר אתו בני	And He buried ⁵⁹ him in the valley ⁶⁰
בארץ מואב	in the land of Moab,
מול בית פעור	opposite Beth-peor, ⁶¹
ולא ידע איש את קברתו	but no man knows his burial place
עד היום הזה	to this day.

In Numbers, there are two passages about the exclusion of Moses: Num 20:12⁶² and Num 27:12-14:

Num 20:12 (MT)	English Translation
12 ויאמר יהוה אל משה	And YHWH said to Moses
ואל אהרן	and Aaron,

⁵⁴ LXX reads καὶ Ἰσαακ (“and Isaak”), but MT does not have a conjunction before ליצחק.

⁵⁵ MT has a singular pronominal suffix in לזרעך, but this singular pronoun does not agree with the three patriarchs whom YHWH was addressing. Therefore, LXX “corrects” it to plural, ὑμῶν.

⁵⁶ Instead of “I have made you see,” LXX has εἰδείξα (“I have showed”) modified by the dative τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς σου (“your eyes”), thus “I have showed it to your eyes,” or simply “I have made you see.” Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 558.

⁵⁷ LXX has οὐκ εἰσελεύσῃ (“will not enter”).

⁵⁸ LXX has διὰ ῥήματος κυρίου (“by the word of the Lord”).

⁵⁹ According to MT, the subject is not clear. LXX uses a plural verb ἔθαψαν (“they buried”) in order to avoid the direct statement that YHWH buried Moses. Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 559. However, the midrashic expansion of Targum Pseudo-Jonathan to the Pentateuch clearly illustrates the tradition that it was none other than God who buried Moses, and accordingly retains a singular verb. McCarthy, *Deuteronomy*, 168*.

⁶⁰ LXX takes בני (“in the valley”) as a proper name, as ἐν Γαῖ (“in Gai”). Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 559.

⁶¹ “Beth-peor” is translated by LXX as οἴκου Φογῶρ (“the house of Phogor”).

⁶² The context is in the narrative of Num 20:1-13.

יען לא האמנתם בי	“Because you have not believed in me, ⁶³
להקדישני	to regard me as holy
לעיני בני ישראל	before the eyes of the Israelites,
לכן לא תביאו	therefore you will not bring ⁶⁴
את הקהל הזה	this assembly
אל הארץ אשר נתתי להם	into the land which I have given to them.”

Num 27:12-14 (MT)	English Translation
12 ויאמר יהוה אל משה	And YHWH said to Moses,
עלה אל הר העברים הזה	“Ascend this mountain of the Abarim, ⁶⁵
וראה את הארץ	and see the land ⁶⁶
אשר נתתי לבני ישראל	which I have given ⁶⁷ to the Israelites. ⁶⁸
13 וראיתה אתה	“When you have seen it,
ונאספת אל עמך	you will be gathered to your people, ⁶⁹
גם אתה	you too
כאשר נאסף אהרן אחיך	as Aaron your brother was gathered. ⁷⁰
14 כאשר מריתם פי	for you rebelled against my word
במדבר צן	in the wilderness of Zin,
במריבת העדה	during the strife of the congregation,

⁶³ MT has יען לא האמנתם בי (“you did not believe in me”), but LXX has οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε, it omits “in me.” Wevers thinks that it is because the modifier להקדישני (“to sanctify me”) also has a first singular pronominal modifier, which LXX translates as ἁγιάσαι με (“to sanctify me”). LXX absolutizes the verb. It is not “believe in me,” but “did not have faith, trust.” See John William Wevers, *Notes on the Greek text of Numbers* (SCS 46; Atlanta, Geo.: Scholars Press, 1998), 327.

⁶⁴ Here, LXX has οὐκ εἰσάξετε ὑμεῖς τὴν συναγωγὴν ταύτην (“you yourselves shall not lead this congregation”). MT has no equivalent for ὑμεῖς (“yourselves”), which is unnecessary to the sense. It was added by the translator to give the sense that it is not you, but someone else, who will lead the Israelites into the Promised Land. See Wevers, *Greek text of Numbers*, 328.

⁶⁵ LXX has ἀνάβηθι εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ ἐν τῷ πέραν τοῦτο ὄρος Ναβαν (“go up into the mountain that [is] on the other side, this mountain Nabau”). The locative ἐν τῷ πέραν (“on the other side”) presumably refers to the other side of the Jordan. There is no counterpart in MT for τοῦτο ὄρος Ναβαν (“this mountain Nabau”). LXX may take Deut 32:49 as a reference. See Wevers, *Greek text of Numbers*, 462-463.

⁶⁶ LXX has τὴν γῆν Χανααν (“the land of Chanaan”). MT does not have the modifier “of Chanaan.”

⁶⁷ LXX has changed the tense of the verb in the relative clause. MT reads נתתי (“I gave”), but LXX translates it as ἐγὼ δίδωμι (“I am giving,” a pronoun with a participle). LXX might understand the conquest of the land was still future, thus the translator changed the tense. See Wevers, *Greek text of Numbers*, 463.

⁶⁸ LXX has ἐν κατασχέσει (“for a possession”).

⁶⁹ SP reads עמך (“your people,” singular) rather than עמיך (“your people,” plural). LXX also has λαόν σου (“your people,” singular).

⁷⁰ LXX has inserted ἐν ὄρ τῷ ὄρει (“in the mountain Hor”).

להקדישני במים	to regard me as holy at the waters
לעיניהם	before their eyes.”
הם מי מריבת קדש מדבר זין	These are the waters of Meribath Kadesh (in) the wilderness of Zin.

Six of them give the *reasons* for Moses’ exclusion, and the other two passages (Deut 31:2 and 34:4-5) do not indicate any reason for the ban from entering the land. Although Moses’ ban from entering the Promised Land are mentioned three times in his same speech (Deut 1-4), their immediate contexts are different. The first of them (Deut 1:37) occurs in the retelling of the spy story.⁷¹ The second one (Deut 3:26-27) is retold in Moses’ retrospective dialogue between YHWH and him. In Deut 4:21, Moses retells his denial in the context of an exhortation to the Israelites.

Regarding Num 20:12; 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52.⁷² All these three passages are not told by Moses, but by the narrators of Numbers and Deuteronomy. The immediate contexts of these three passages are very different. In Num 20:1-13, the first announcement of Moses’ exclusion occurs in YHWH’s words of judgment after the miracle of the waters of Meribah. In Num 27:12-14 God’s command is placed in the introduction of the theme of new leadership. Joshua will be the new leader after Moses died. The succession of Joshua (Num 27:15-23) occurs *after* the command of going up the mountain. In Deuteronomy, however, the ordination of Joshua to

⁷¹ Another version of the spy story is told in Num 13-14, but the Numeri version does not have a record that YHWH was angry with Moses or that he was forbidden to enter Canaan.

⁷² They are traditionally classified as relating to the Priestly traditions, for example: S. R. Driver, *Deuteronomy* (3d ed.; ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1901), 26-27; Carl Steuernagel, *Deuteronomium und Josua* (HKAT 3; Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1900), 122; Jeffrey H. Tigay, *Deuteronomy* (JPSTC; Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1996), 518.

become the new leader occurs *before* the command of God to Moses in Deut 32:48-52. Joshua has already been encouraged by Moses (Deut 31:7-8), and by YHWH (Deut 32:23).

It seems that Deut 31:2 and Deut 34:4-5 do not give any explicit explanation to Moses' exclusion. In the final form of Deuteronomy, Deut 31:1-6 follows the covenant made in Moab (Deut 29-30), while the narrative of Deut 34:1-6 records the last action of Moses and the saying of YHWH to Moses before he died.

2. Review of recent studies on the different versions

The above passages present at least two different versions of Moses' exclusion from the Promised Land. The differences are not merely in the vocabulary and style of the language. One of the differences had been spotted by Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette: Deut 1:37 reports that at Kadesh Barnea the angry YHWH had already denied to Moses the hope of entering the Land of Canaan, an event which in fact Num 20:12-13 and 27:14 report finally occurred at the waters of striving (or waters of Meribah) at Kadesh in the Wilderness of Sin.⁷³ Hence, Deut 1:37 points to

⁷³ "Refert c. 1, 37. jam apud Cadesbarneam Jehovam iratum Mosi terram Canaan ingrediendi spem negasse, quod tamen apud aquas contentionis Cadesi in deserto Sin demum evenisse traditur Num. 20, 12. et c. 27, 14." W. M. L. de Wette, *Dissertatio critico-exegetica qua Deuteronomium a prioribus Pentateuchi libris diversum, alius cuiusdam recentioris auctoris opus esse monstratur* (Jean: Literis Etzdorfii, 1805), 15. For a resetting of the Latin version and a German translation, see H. P. Mathys, "Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wettes *Dissertatio critico-exegetica* von 1805," in *Biblische Theologie und historisches Denken: Wissenschaftsgeschichtliche Studien* (ed. M. Keßler and M. Wallraf; Basel: Schwabe, 2008), 171-211; For an English translation of de Wette's *Dissertatio*, see P. B. Harvey and B. Halpern, "W. M. L. de Wette's 'Dissertatio Critica...': Context and Translation," *ZABR* 14 (2008): 47-85.

the spy narrative which was 38 years⁷⁴ earlier than the incident in the waters of Meribah (Num 20:1-13).

How do the scholars deal with these two versions of the exclusion of Moses? A broad overview of the research about the denial of Moses' entry in Deuteronomy is that in Deut 1:37 (3:26 and 4:21),⁷⁵ the most discussed issues are the meaning of "on your account," and whether Moses was innocent in the spy story.⁷⁶ As regards the

⁷⁴ or 37 years.

⁷⁵ They are traditionally classified as relating to the Deuteronomistic or Deuteronomistic traditions, for example: Ian Cairns, *Word and Presence: A Commentary on the Book of Deuteronomy* (ITC; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1992), 291; Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 27; George A. Smith, *The Book of Deuteronomy* (CBSC; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1918), 25.

⁷⁶ Alfred Bertholet, *Deuteronomium* (KHCAT; Freiburg: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1899), 6; Joseph Blenkinsopp, "Deuteronomy," in *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary* (ed. R. E. Brown et al.; Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1990), 96; Georg Braulik, *Deuteronomium I Kapitel 1,1-16,17* (NEB 15; Würzburg: Echter, 1986), 28-29; Walter Brueggeman, *Deuteronomy* (ABOTC; Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 2001), 32; Pierre Buis and Jacques Leclercq, *Le Deutéronome* (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1963), 40; Christoph Bultmann, "Deuteronomy," in *The Oxford Bible Commentary: The Pentateuch* (ed. John Barton et al.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 193; Cairns, *Deuteronomy*, 37-38; Duane L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 1-11* (WBC 6A; Dallas, Tex.: Word Books, 1991), 31; Peter C. Craigie, *The Book of Deuteronomy* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1976), 105; C. F. August Dillmann, *Die Bücher Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua* (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1886), 239-240; Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 26-27; Hubert Junker, *Deuteronomium* (Würzburg: Echter, 1952), 11; Eduard König, *Das Deuteronomium: eingeleitet, übersetzt und erklärt von Eduard König* (KAT 3; Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1917), 70; Bernard M. Levinson, "Deuteronomy," in *The Jewish Study Bible* (ed. A. Berlin and M. Z. Brettler; 2d ed; New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 347, 351; Jack R. Lundbom, *Deuteronomy: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2013), 181; A. D. H. Mayes, *Deuteronomy* (NCBC; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1979), 132, 147; J. G. McConville, *Deuteronomy* (AOTC5; Nottingham: Apollos, 2002), 71; Patrick D. Miller, *Deuteronomy* (Interpretation; Louisville, Kent.: John Knox Press, 1990), 42-44; W. L. Moran, "Deuteronomy," in *A New Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture* (ed. R. C. Fuller et al.; London: Nelson, 1969), 261-262; Richard D. Nelson, *Deuteronomy: A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville, Kent.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002), 56; Eduard Nielsen, *Deuteronomium* (HAT6; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1995), 52-53; Eckart Otto, *Deuteronomium 1,1-4,43* (HThKAT; Freiburg: Herder, 2012), 397; Lothar Perlitt, *Deuteronomium (1,19-2,23)* (BKAT 5/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1991), 119-120; Anthony Phillips, *Deuteronomy* (CBC; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 19; Gerhard von Rad, *Deuteronomy: A Commentary* (trans. D. Barton; OTL; London: SCM, 1966), 45; trans. of *Das fünfte Buch Mose: Deuteronomium* (ATD 8; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964); Martin Rose, *5. Mose Teilband 2: 5. Mose 1-11 und 26-34* (ZBAT 5; Zurich: Theologischer, 1994), 485; Smith, *Deuteronomy*, 24-25, 55; Steuernagel, *Deuteronomium*, 6; J. A. Thompson, *Deuteronomy* (TOTC; Leicester: IVP, 1974), 100-101; Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 19; Timo Veijola, *Das fünfte Buch Mose: Deuteronomium Kapitel 1,1-16,17* (ATD 8,1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 41; Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1-11* (AB5; New York: Doubleday, 1991), 150; Christopher Wright, *Deuteronomy* (NIBC; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1996), 41-42; G. Ernest Wright, "The Book of Deuteronomy," in *The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. II* (ed. G. A. Buttrick et al.; Nashville: Abingdon, 1953), 339, 349-350.

other version of Moses exclusion reported in Deut 32:48-52, most scholars explain that this passage belongs to the Priestly tradition,⁷⁷ and the focus is on the sin of Moses. Although there are many works devoted to the sin of Moses, not many studies aim to investigate the two versions of the exclusion of Moses. Here, six works are selected to discuss because they have attempted to explain the tension of the two versions of Moses' exclusion in detail. These six works can be divided into two main categories. In the first place, two of them (Paul Kissling and Jean-Pierre Sonnet) adopt a "narrative approach" or a synchronic approach, and take only the final form of Deuteronomy into consideration. The works in the second category (Thomas W. Mann, William H. C. Propp, Johnson T. K. Lim and Won Lee), which take a diachronic approach, do not carry out a holistic reading of the books of Numbers and Deuteronomy, nor smooth out the differences between the layers in the books, rather they emphasise the differences between the Deuteronomic tradition and the Priestly tradition. We will first deal with the synchronic approach.

⁷⁷ Bertholet, *Deuteronomium*, 101-102; Blenkinsopp, "Deuteronomy," 108; Georg Braulik, *Deuteronomium II Kapitel 16,18-34,12* (NEB 28; Würzburg: Echter, 1992), 236; Buis and Leclercq, *Le Deutéronome*, 203; Cairns, *Deuteronomy*, 291; Dillmann, *Deuteronomium*, 413 (Dillmann uses the symbol "A" to represent the Priestly document.); Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 382-383; Levinson, "Deuteronomy," 423; Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 911; Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 394; Miller, *Deuteronomy*, 242; Moran, "Deuteronomy," 275; Nielsen, *Deuteronomium*, 285; Phillips, *Deuteronomy*, 222; von Rad, *Deuteronomy*, 201; Smith, *Deuteronomy*, 25, 359; Steuernagel, *Deuteronomium*, 122; Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 317, 518; G. E. Wright, "Deuteronomy," 526.

The Synchronic Approach

Paul J. Kissling

The aim of Paul Kissling's book⁷⁸ is to assess the reliability of four biblical characters in the Primary History.⁷⁹ Moses is one of the four characters under his examination. Kissling selects Moses' exclusion from Canaan as the evidence for divergence in point of view between Moses and the narrator of the Primary History. Kissling does not assign the different versions of Moses' ban as D or P traditions, but as Moses' version (Deut 1:37; 3:26; 4:21), YHWH's version (Deut 32:48-52) and the narrator's version (Num 20:1-13). He compares Moses' version with the narrator's, and observes that Moses told a different story about the cause of his denial of entry.⁸⁰ In addition, in Deut 32:48-52, YHWH and the narrator attribute that the real reason for Moses' denial is his own actions and words at Kadesh.⁸¹ Moses' fault was not YHWH's anger at Israel in the spy story as Moses claimed. According to Kissling, this divergence shows that Moses is not reliable as regards his exclusion from Canaan.⁸²

Kissling states that the narrator never gives an independent account of the conversation between Moses and YHWH as recorded in Deut 3:23-29.⁸³ Therefore, the reader cannot confirm that Moses' sayings are accurate and the conversation

⁷⁸ Paul J. Kissling, *Reliable Characters in the Primary History: Profiles of Moses, Joshua, Elijah and Elisha* (JSOTSup 224; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996).

⁷⁹ Kissling refers to D. N. Freedman's definition of "Primary History": from Genesis to Kings. See D. N. Freedman, "Deuteronomistic History," *IDBSup*: 226.

⁸⁰ Kissling, *Reliable Characters*, 46.

⁸¹ Kissling, *Reliable Characters*, 50.

⁸² Kissling, *Reliable Characters*, 51.

⁸³ Kissling, *Reliable Characters*, 48-49.

actually took place.⁸⁴ But, where does this information, which the reader cannot confirm, come from? In fact, all the sayings of Moses are retold by the narrator. The reader can only read the word of Moses as portrayed by the narrator. In fact, Kissling is comparing Moses' explanations, which are portrayed by the narrator, with another explanation given by the narrator himself. The reader cannot confirm that all the information given by the narrator is correct if the reader is not sure that the narrator is reliable. However, is the narrator reliable?

Although Kissling has already assumed that the narrator is reliable,⁸⁵ one may question Kissling's assumption. The reliability of the narrator can also be assessed by using Kissling's own principle: comparing the narrator's *former* statements with his *latter* statements. If an internal consistency can be observed, the narrator is said to be reliable. However, some internal contradictions can be found from the report of the narrator in the so-called Primary History. These examples are: in Gen 1:25-26 the narrator tells the reader that the animals were created *before* the human beings, but in Gen 2:19 the narrator states that the animals were formed *after* the man;⁸⁶ in Gen 37:36 the narrator depicts that Joseph was sold to Potiphar by *the Midianites*, while in Gen 39:1 it is said that Joseph was sold by *the Ishmaelites*;⁸⁷ in Exod 33:7-11, the tent of meeting has been already built, while in Exod 35:21 it is said that the people started to contribute the materials for the building of the tent of meeting, and all the

⁸⁴ Kissling, *Reliable Characters*, 49.

⁸⁵ Kissling, *Reliable Characters*, 26.

⁸⁶ H. H. Rowley, "Introduction to the Old Testament," in *A Companion to the Bible* (ed. H. H. Rowley; 2d ed.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1963), 28.

⁸⁷ Rowley, "Introduction," 28.

work of the tent of meeting was finished until Exod 39:32;⁸⁸ the narrator also tells different versions of the conqueror(s) of Hebron: Joshua and all Israel (Josh 10:36), Caleb (Josh 15:14), and the people of Judah (Judg 1:10).⁸⁹ These discrepancies show that the narrator is not as reliable as Kissling assumed.⁹⁰

Jean-Pierre Sonnet

Jean-Pierre Sonnet also believes that Deuteronomy can be read as a narrative.⁹¹ He argues that Moses betrays his human point of view in the way he tells the story in Deut 1-4.⁹² Moses presents his fate as originating in the fault of the people.⁹³ In Deut 32:48-52 the narrator's final account reports how God educates Moses. YHWH reminds Moses what he pretends to have forgotten.⁹⁴ Such account corrects the data that Moses has distorted.⁹⁵

The narrative approach used by Sonnet has at least two assumptions. First, there is only *one* narrator in the book of Deuteronomy. Second, the human character in the

⁸⁸ For more discussion of the two tents of meeting, see Israel Knohl, "Two Aspects of the 'Tent of Meeting'," in *Tehillah le Moshe: Biblical and Judaic Studies in Honor of Moshe Greenberg* (ed. M. Cogan et al.; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1997), 73-79.

⁸⁹ J. Maxwell Miller and John H. Hayes, *A History of Ancient Israel and Judah* (2d ed.; Louisville, Kent.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006), 73.

⁹⁰ Perhaps another way to look at the problem of the assumption is that Kissling assumes that there is *one* narrator only. If it is assumed that there are several narrators, the internal contradictions quoted above can be explained by the fact that different narrators are presenting their own stories. Jean-L. Ska also points out that "it is difficult to maintain that the Pentateuch or the Deuteronomistic History were written at one go by one author. Several hands were at work and we have enough proof of this." See Jean-Louis Ska, "Narrator or Narrators," in *The Exegesis of the Pentateuch: Exegetical Studies and Basic Questions* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 226.

⁹¹ Jean-Pierre Sonnet, *The book within the book: Writing in Deuteronomy* (BIS 14; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 183-198; Jean-Pierre Sonnet, "Le rendez-vous du Dieu vivant: La mort de Moïse dans l'intrigue du Deutéronome (Dt 1-4 et Dt 31-34)," *NRTh* 123 (2001): 353-372.

⁹² Sonnet, *The book*, 198.

⁹³ Sonnet, "Le rendez-vous," 359.

⁹⁴ Sonnet, "Le rendez-vous," 364.

⁹⁵ Sonnet, *The book*, 198.

narrative represents the limited and fallible point of view, while the narrator's point of view is omniscient and authoritative.⁹⁶ These two assumptions may not be correct. We can look at the first assumption. Is there only *one* narrator in the book of Deuteronomy? Although Deuteronomy is a book, it cannot be taken for granted that one book must have only one narrator. Rather, as we shall see in Chapter Three, the stylistic, factual and theological evidence can establish that Deut 32:48-52 is not written by the same author/school who wrote the main part of Deuteronomy. If there are several narrators in the same book, it is natural that there are different points of view.

In regard to the second assumption, we may ask the question: is the point of view of the narrator necessarily omniscient and authoritative? It is doubtful that the narrator's description is always accurate. According to the narrator's record, in Deut 34:1, Moses went up Mount Nebo, the top of Pisgah. However, Mount Nebo is different from the summit of Pisgah.⁹⁷ This summit refers to Ras es-Siyaghah, which is slightly lower than the top of Mount Nebo and separated from it by a saddle.⁹⁸ There are about eight kms distance between these two summits. Therefore, it is impossible for Moses to go up the top of Mount Nebo and the summit of Pisgah at the same time. This geographical fact can show that the narrator is not as authoritative as Sonnet assumed. The most probable explanation to the juxtaposition

⁹⁶ Sonnet, "Le rendez-vous," 356.

⁹⁷ Eckart Otto, *Deuteronomium 23,16-34,12* (HTKAT; Freiburg: Herder, 2017), 2199.

⁹⁸ Christensen, *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12*, 871.

of these two mountain names is that Deut 34:1 is the work of a redactor who would like to harmonize the two commands to Moses to ascend different mountains.

According to Deut 3:27, YHWH orders Moses to ascend the summit of Pisgah, while in Deut 32:49, YHWH commands him to go up Mount Nebo.

Hence, the holistic reading used by Kissling and Sonnet cannot give a satisfactory answer to the tension of the two versions in Deuteronomy.

The Diachronic Approach

Thomas Mann and Johnson T. K. Lim

The conclusions of Thomas Mann and those of Johnson Lim are so similar that we may review their interpretations together. We first look at Mann's study. In his article, Mann interprets the denial of Moses in Deut 1:37, 3:26-27 as a reassessment within the Deuteronomistic School itself regarding the understanding of the corporate relationship between the leader and people, while the other version (in Num 20:1-13; Num 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52) provides an opposite view proposed by the Priestly School.⁹⁹

Building on F. M. Cross' "block-model" of the Deuteronomistic History,¹⁰⁰

Mann argues that the first Deuteronomistic historian (Dtr¹) understood that the people

⁹⁹ Thomas W. Mann, "Theological Reflections on the Denial of Moses," *JBL* 98 (1979): 481-494.

¹⁰⁰ F. M. Cross uses the term "Deuteronomistic" in his essay "The Themes of the Book of Kings and the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History," see F. M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973), 274-289. However, Mann always use the term "Deuteronomistic" instead. For a summary of Cross' "block-model," see Walter Dietrich, "Deuteronomistic History," *RPP* 3:784; Thomas Römer, "Deuteronomistic History," *EBR* 6:649.

were punished because of the leader's apostasy.¹⁰¹ A redactor wrestled with the relationship between leader and people after the death of king Josiah.¹⁰² He believed that the leader was punished because of the people's lack of faith. The redactor, according to Mann, inserted Deut 1:37 and 3:26-27 in Deuteronomy to present his dissenting voice within the Deuteronomistic School.¹⁰³ The redactor correlated Moses with Josiah to propose that "corporate doom" would come even to the ideal leaders, Moses and Josiah.¹⁰⁴

In Mann's view, the Deuteronomistic School imputes "corporate responsibility" as the reason, while the Priestly School opts for the "individual responsibility" of Moses. By studying the use of the two verbs "believe" and "rebel," Mann argues that the Priestly School knew the addition of Moses' exclusion in Deut 1, and "was thus deliberately countering that explanation with an opposing view."¹⁰⁵ The Priestly School explained that Moses' exclusion was not due to the people's unfaithfulness, but Moses' own.¹⁰⁶ The Priestly School holds the view that everyone should die for his own sin. Although these two schools have different views, both of them attempt to deal with the meaning of Moses' denial of entry for their contemporaries.¹⁰⁷

Johnson Lim also draws attention to the issue of "individual responsibility" and "corporate responsibility." After discussing seven ways of interpreting the passages

¹⁰¹ Mann, "Theological Reflections," 490.

¹⁰² Mann, "Theological Reflections," 492.

¹⁰³ Mann, "Theological Reflections," 491.

¹⁰⁴ Mann, "Theological Reflections," 493-494.

¹⁰⁵ Mann, "Theological Reflections," 484.

¹⁰⁶ Mann, "Theological Reflections," 485.

¹⁰⁷ Mann, "Theological Reflections," 494.

in Deut 1:37, 3:26 and 4:21,¹⁰⁸ Lim solves the conflict between these three passages and Deut 32:48-52 by recognizing that they are from different traditions.¹⁰⁹ Lim states that the two traditions are products of two different schools.¹¹⁰ The traditions interpret the sin of Moses from different perspectives and hence produce different interpretations. The Deuteronomistic School stresses “corporate responsibility” while the Priestly School stresses “personal accountability.” According to him, “corporate responsibility” and “personal accountability” are like the two sides of a coin, they are the “two-sided” lesson.¹¹¹

Both Mann and Lim claim that the Deuteronomistic School sides with “corporate responsibility” and the Priestly School is for “individual responsibility.”¹¹² This dichotomy of one school siding with only one kind of responsibility is without solid foundation. A more thorough discussion of this issue will be given in Part III of this thesis, here, two points deserve to be mentioned. Firstly, it is not correct to state that the Deuteronomistic text sides only with “corporate responsibility.” It cannot be denied that there are laws in Deuteronomy implying corporate responsibility. One such example is Deut 5:9:

“You shall not bow down to them or worship them; for I YHWH your God am a jealous God, punishing children for the iniquity of parents, to the third

¹⁰⁸ The seven ways include: 1) The redactional process; 2) Identification of the leader with his people; 3) Relationship between an individual and the community; 4) Divergent voices in Deuteronomy; 5) Relating two traditions; 6) Individual responsibility; 7) Literary analysis. See Johnson T. K. Lim, “The sin of Moses in Deuteronomy,” *AJT* 17 (2003): 250-266.

¹⁰⁹ Lim, “Sin of Moses,” 262.

¹¹⁰ Lim, “Sin of Moses,” 262.

¹¹¹ Lim, “Sin of Moses,” 263.

¹¹² Lim, “Sin of Moses,” 263.

and forth generations of those who reject me...”

Should the phrase “punishing children for the iniquity of parents, to the third and forth generations” be read in literally? The literal sense of this phrase is that the children will be punished because of their parents’ iniquity. Then it implies a corporate punishment in the family. Andrew Mayes believes that this phrase apparently derives from the Deuteronomic compiler of the Decalogue, and its purpose is to reconcile the old formula, according to which the whole family bears “communal responsibility” for each of its members with the later view of individual responsibility.¹¹³ However, Moshe Weinfeld argues that this phrase is not to be taken literally. It, according to Weinfeld, refers to a large number of descendants and actually parallels the corresponding clause, “showing steadfast love to the thousandth generation,” which designates not exactly a thousand generations.¹¹⁴ It is not my purpose to give a thorough examination of their arguments here. The point is that there is a possibility of finding the concept of “corporate responsibility” in the Deuteronomic Decalogue, but it is controversial.

However, the idea of “individual responsibility” can also be found in Deuteronomy. For instance, in the D version of the spy story, the second generation of the Exodus could receive the land because they did not know “good and evil” (Deut 1:39). Deut 1:36 and 38 also state that Caleb and Joshua could see or enter the land because of their special character or mission. Caleb follows YHWH completely,

¹¹³ Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 167.

¹¹⁴ Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1-11*, 296.

and Joshua is the one who will secure Israel's possession of the land.

Besides, the judicial assessment of penalties in Deut 24:16, is also a clear example of "individual responsibility" in Deuteronomy:

"Parents shall not be put to death for children, nor children be put to death for parents: a person shall be put to death only for his own crime."

Mayes states that this verse "gives no sign of being a late addition; it must ... be an older law quoted by the Deuteronomic legislator."¹¹⁵ Gerhard von Rad also evaluates that "a thorough study of early legal history ... has shown that the conception of a general development from collective to individual liability is incorrect. The principle of personal responsibility was by no means unknown in the earlier times."¹¹⁶ Furthermore, according to Deut 29:18-20, it is said that YHWH will *single out* the one, who go his own stubborn ways, from all the tribes of Israel for all the calamity according to the curses written in the book of law. Since the idea of "individual responsibility" can be found in a law and a curse in Deuteronomy, it is not accurate to state that Deuteronomy is only for "corporate responsibility."

Thus, both the concept of "corporate responsibility/ punishment" and "individual responsibility/ punishment" can be found in Deuteronomy. The texts are more complicated than the dichotomy model suggested.

¹¹⁵ Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 326.

¹¹⁶ Von Rad, *Deuteronomy*, 152. Some scholars may doubt whether Deut 24:16 belonged originally to Deuteronomy. For instance, Rof   says that, "the law in 24:16... conflicts with the law in 13:13-19... We thus have here a composition that comes from juridical circles and that is distinct from, and even in conflict with, the ritual law strata of Deuteronomy..." See A. Rof  , *Deuteronomy: Issues and Interpretation* (ed. David J. Reimer; London; New York: T&T Clark, 2002), 118. Some may even take Deut 24:16 as dependent on Jer 31:29 and Ezek 18. See Smith, *Deuteronomy*, 283. But these opinions do not exclude the concept of personal accountability from Deuteronomy.

William H. C. Propp

William Propp also holds that the two versions of the explanation of Moses' denial came from the Deuteronomic source and the Priestly source.¹¹⁷ According to Propp, the Deuteronomic source "likes Moses very much," and Moses was innocent but was punished for the people's sin.¹¹⁸ Moses, by paying the price of being an intercessor, identifies himself with the guilty party he represents.¹¹⁹

However, the Priestly writing has a different attitude towards Moses. The Moses of the Priestly source is "innately flawed."¹²⁰ In the Priestly writing, Moses was ordered to take Aaron's rod for display only. It was supposed to be a silent rebuke to the rebels, not supposed to be used for striking. But Moses struck the rock with the rod. According to Propp, Aaron is completely innocent. There might be a sort of guilt by association, because it is Aaron's rod.¹²¹ Propp thinks that in the Priestly writing, Moses represents the Levites and the prophets, while Aaron represents the priests.¹²² To the Priestly tradition, the Levites and the prophets were rivals.¹²³ Propp suggests that the tense relationship between the priests, the Levites and the prophets provides the key to understanding P's claims on Moses' fault.¹²⁴

Thus, Propp explains the tension between the two traditions by showing the different

¹¹⁷ William. H. Propp, "Why Moses Could not Enter the Promised Land," *BR* 14 (1998): 37.

¹¹⁸ Propp, "Why Moses," 37.

¹¹⁹ Propp, "Why Moses," 38.

¹²⁰ Propp, "Why Moses," 38.

¹²¹ Propp, "Why Moses," 42.

¹²² Propp, "Why Moses," 39.

¹²³ Propp, "Why Moses," 39.

¹²⁴ Propp, "Why Moses," 39.

attitudes of the Deuteronomic and the Priestly writing toward Moses. Consequently, he proposes that there was a conflict among the priest, the Levites and the prophets.

Is there enough evidence for Propp's reconstruction of the tension between the different social groups? On the one hand, Propp states that Moses represents the Levites and the prophets in the Priestly source.¹²⁵ On the other hand, Propp quotes Num 16-17 to illustrate that the Levites had sought priestly status for the Levites.¹²⁶ However, according to Num 16:3, 19 (two Priestly verses) the Levites are not only against Aaron, but also Moses. If Moses is the Levites' representative, will they confront him? Besides, it is Moses who responds to the Levites, not Aaron (Num 16:5-11). In the Priestly portrayal of the rebellion of the Levites, Moses is facing the conflict face to face. It seems that the Levites do not think that Moses is their representative.¹²⁷ Hence, the basis for the reconstruction of the tension is not strong enough, and this reconstruction cannot be used to explain the two versions of Moses' exclusion.

¹²⁵ Propp, "Why Moses," 39.

¹²⁶ Propp, "Why Moses," 39.

¹²⁷ Propp says that the Priestly source consider the Levites and prophets are rivals, see Propp, "Why Moses," 39. Do the Deuteronomic texts also see the priests as rivals? There are a few examples to show that the priest has an eminent role in Deuteronomy. For instance, when the people want to give the first of all the fruit of the ground to YHWH, they should go to the priest (not the Levites), speak to him, and hand their baskets to him. Then the priest would take the basket from their hands and set it down before YHWH's altar (Deut 26:1-4). Before the Israelites go out to war, the priest (not the Levites or prophets) will come forward and speak words of exhortation to the troops (Deut 20:1-4). In Deut 31:9, the priests were one of the groups who received the law from Moses. In several instances, it is depicted that the priest works with the judge and the Levites to minister to the people (Deut 17:9, 12; 19:17; 21:5; 24:8). The people are told to obey the priest(s) (Deut 17:12; 24:8). Furthermore, according to Deut 18:1-8, the priest is mentioned first to receive part of the offerings, then the Levites. Only the priest is said to be chosen by YHWH in that context. These examples show that the book of Deuteronomy does not consider the priests as rivals. Hence, there is no solid foundation to support that there is a tension between the priest(s) and the Deuteronomic school in the period when Deuteronomy was formed.

Won Lee

Won Lee's article aims to introduce "conceptual analysis,"¹²⁸ and to illustrate how the method works in the exegesis of Num 20:1-13.¹²⁹ Lee argues that the three concepts found in the Priestly passage Num 20:1-13 are: i) The justifiable complaint of the people; ii) The unjustifiable responses of Moses and Aaron; and iii) The justifiable punishment of YHWH.¹³⁰ According to Lee, Moses is the representative of God to the people in the Priestly tradition. Such tradition stresses the leaders' representing God's intention to the people.¹³¹ However, in the incident of the waters of Meribah, Moses and Aaron misrepresented God's intention and mischaracterized God.¹³² Since Moses and Aaron were not good leaders, their leadership was taken away.

Lee's treatment of the Deuteronomic texts is quite brief.¹³³ He asserts that Moses is the leader for the *people* in the Deuteronomic tradition. Lee argues that the "you" in the key term "because of you" in Deut 1:37 refers to the "spies" rather than the Israelites.¹³⁴ He observes that Deut 1:35-38 "focus particularly on leaders"

¹²⁸ "Concepts," according to Lee, are "inexplicit textual information located foundationally underneath the surface expression of a text." The first step of "conceptual analysis" is to put both "explicit statements" and "implicit presuppositions" of a text through a rigorous analysis. The second step is to investigate the relationship between the two. A conceptual analysis must be done of the final form of the text and also any stage of the text in its literary growth. See Won Lee, "The exclusion of Moses from the Promised Land: a conceptual approach," in *Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty-First Century* (ed. Marvin A. Sweeney and E. Ben Zvi; Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 2003), 220-222.

¹²⁹ Lee, "Conceptual Approach," 217.

¹³⁰ Lee, "Conceptual Approach," 225-236.

¹³¹ Lee, "Conceptual Approach," 238-239.

¹³² Lee, "Conceptual Approach," 233-236.

¹³³ Lee gives his interpretation on the Deuteronomic passages in two paragraphs, but he has devoted 24 paragraphs to the Priestly texts.

¹³⁴ Lee, "Conceptual Approach," 236.

because Caleb (Deut 1:36) and Joshua (Deut 1:38) are spy and leader respectively.¹³⁵

Therefore, according to Lee, Deut 1:37-38 is not a case of personal tragedy for

Moses, but instead his “leadership cannot be completed” because of YHWH’s anger with the chosen “spies.”¹³⁶

In Deut 1:23, Moses agrees to the people’s proposal of sending spies and also selects the spies. Lee thinks that this is the “poor judgment” of Moses as a leader.¹³⁷ Moses misused his leadership in compromising his integrity by approving the plan of the spy mission and by appointing the twelve men.¹³⁸ Lee also admits that in the Deuteronomic texts, although the focus of Moses’ exclusion is on his leadership, the cause is the sin of the people.¹³⁹ The Deuteronomic tradition focuses on Moses’ guiding role for the people as he faced the “corporate doom” against which even Moses was “pulled down” with them.¹⁴⁰ Lee emphasizes that the Priestly and Deuteronomic traditions are standing side by side, though each is making its own theological claim. It is not advisable to choose one, or harmonize or collapse the two into one.¹⁴¹

Lee’s suggestion, that the “you” in “because of you” (Deut 1:37) refers to the spies,¹⁴² is open to challenge for the following reasons: (i) In Deut 1:34 Moses said that YHWH heard “your (the Israelites) words,” it will be natural that the “you” in

¹³⁵ Lee, “Conceptual Approach,” 237.

¹³⁶ Lee, “Conceptual Approach,” 237.

¹³⁷ Lee, “Conceptual Approach,” 237.

¹³⁸ Lee, “Conceptual Approach,” 236.

¹³⁹ Lee, “Conceptual Approach,” 237.

¹⁴⁰ Lee, “Conceptual Approach,” 237, 239.

¹⁴¹ Lee, “Conceptual Approach,” 218, 239.

¹⁴² Lee, “Conceptual Approach,” 237.

“because of you” (Deut 1:37) refers to *the Israelites*. (ii) Lee’s suggestion that “these men” (Deut 1:35) can refer to “exclusively the spies”¹⁴³ assumes that verse 35 and verse 36 are contrasting the fates of the ten spies with Caleb. However, this is not the only possibility. If verse 35 and verse 36 represent a contrast between an evil generation (the people) with one man (Caleb) who followed YHWH completely, then “these men” (Deut 1:35) can refer to the *people*. (iii) According to Deut 2:14, the soldiers of the first generation had already died. Since the ten spies belonged to the first generation, they should also have been dead. It will be awkward if Moses spoke these words to the ten spies who could not be the listeners at that time. (iv) The similar phrases “for your sake” and “because of you” or “because of your words” also occur in Deut 3:26 and Deut 4:21, but their contexts will not allow the “you” in these phrases to be interpreted as the ten spies. In these contexts, Moses was speaking to the *people*. Hence, Lee’s suggestion that Moses should bear the punishment with the spies is not likely to be correct.

¹⁴³ Lee, “Conceptual Approach,” 237.

Are Num 20:1-13; 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52 Priestly writings?¹⁴⁴

Mann, Lim, Propp and Lee all classify Num 20:1-13; 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52 as “Priestly” text.¹⁴⁵ Their classification is based on the consensus of the Documentary Hypothesis at the time when Mann’s article was published. However, the Priestly nature of these texts is under revision. Lothar Perlitt denies that there is solid ground for hypothesizing a Priestly redaction of Deuteronomy.¹⁴⁶ Rather, Deut 1:3; 32:48-52 and 34:1a, 7-9 were composed by scribal redactors who mixed the Deuteronomic with the Priestly language. In addition, the Priestly nature of Num 20:1-13; 27:12-14 is also under question when other scholars search for the end of the Priestly writing. Thomas Pola suggests that the end of the Priestly writing is in Exodus 40, and therefore, Num 20:1-13; 27:12-14 are not Priestly texts.¹⁴⁷ The

¹⁴⁴ This study will take the view that the Priestly writing is a *source* rather than a *redaction*. For comments on the current studies of the Priestly texts, see Joel S. Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch: Renewing the Documentary Hypothesis* (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2012), 169-192; Erhard Blum, “Issues and Problems in the Contemporary Debate Regarding the Priestly Writings,” in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions* (ed. S. Shectman and J. S. Baden; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2009), 31-44; David M. Carr, “Changes in Pentateuchal Criticism,” in *The Twentieth Century – From Modernism to Post-Modernism* (ed. Magne Sæbø; Vol. III/2 of *Hebrew Bible/ Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*, ed. Magne Sæbø; (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015), 433-466 (especially 454-460); Jan Christian Gertz, “The Partial Compositions,” in *T&T Clark Handbook of Old Testament: An Introduction to the Literature, Religion and History of the Old Testament* (ed. J. C. Gertz et al; trans. P. Altmann; London; New York: T&T Clark International, 2012), 293-305; Christophe Nihan and Thomas Römer, “Le débat actuel sur la formation du Pentateuque,” in *Introduction à l’Ancien Testament* (ed. T. Römer, J.-D. Macchi and C. Nihan; 2d ed.; Genève: Labor et Fides, 2009), 165-175; Thomas Römer, “Der Pentateuch,” in *Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments* (ed. W. Dietrich et al.; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2014), 53-93 (especially section 3. “Die priesterliche Schicht des Pentateuchs,” 90-93) and Erich Zenger and Christian Frevel, “Das priester(schrift)liche Werk (P),” in *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (ed. E. Zenger and C. Frevel; 8th ed.; Kohlhammer Studienbücher Theologie 1/1; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2012), 189-214.

¹⁴⁵ Mann, “Theological Reflections,” 481, 483; Lim, “Sin of Moses,” 259, 262; Propp, “Why Moses,” 40; Lee, “Conceptual Approach,” 217.

¹⁴⁶ Lothar Perlitt, “Priesterschrift im Deuteronomium?,” *ZAW* 100 (1988): 65-88.

¹⁴⁷ Thomas Pola, *Die ursprüngliche Priesterschrift: Beobachtungen zur Literarkritik und Traditionsgeschichte von Pg* (WMANT 70; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1995), 353.

ending of Priestly tradition is still under discussion, but without a consensus.¹⁴⁸

Scholars such as Eckart Otto,¹⁴⁹ Erich Zenger,¹⁵⁰ M. Köckert and Christophe Nihan,¹⁵¹ Norbert Lohfink,¹⁵² Horst Seebass,¹⁵³ and Christian Frevel¹⁵⁴ all have different opinions on this issue. Consequently, the Priestly nature of these three passages should be re-examined carefully.

In sum, it is commonly believed that on the one hand, the Deuteronomic tradition presents that Moses is not sinful in the spy story; the people are sinful, and Moses is punished because he is the leader of the people. On the other hand, the Priestly tradition presents Moses and Aaron to have sinned in the incident of waters of Meribah; the people are not sinful, and Moses is punished because of his own actions. The binary opposition of individual responsibility and corporate punishment is simplistic and needs to be reassessed. In the past it has been most usual to assume that Num 20:1-13; 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52 are Priestly writings, however, the recent observations and theories call for a new examination of the passages' Priestly nature.

¹⁴⁸ Blum, "Issues," 40.

¹⁴⁹ For E. Otto, the ending of P is Exod 29:42-46, see Eckart Otto, "Pentateuch," *RPP* 9:688.

¹⁵⁰ E. Zenger thinks that P ends in Lev 9:23-24, see E. Zenger and C. Frevel, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (8th ed. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 2012), 199.

¹⁵¹ M. Köckert and C. Nihan propose that P ends in Lev 16, see Zenger and Frevel, *Einleitung*, 199.

¹⁵² N. Lohfink thinks that the ending of P is Jos 18:1 and 19:51, see Norbert Lohfink, *Theology of the Pentateuch: Themes of the Priestly Narrative and Deuteronomy* (trans. L. M. Maloney; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 145, n. 29.

¹⁵³ According to Seebass, the Priestly tradition ends in the book of Joshua. See Horst Seebass, "Josua," *BN* 28 (1985): 53-65.

¹⁵⁴ According to C. Frevel, the ending of P is Deut 32:48-50, 52 and 34: 1*, 5*, 7a, 8, see Zenger and Frevel, *Einleitung*, 202.

3. Approach and the plan of the present study

This study is a criticism of the passages of Moses' exclusion. It should be stressed that this study will not carry out a holistic reading of the book of Deuteronomy because the book was not formed within one short period by one hand. In addition, this study will not insist on the authority of the final canonical form because we believe that the meaning of a text is found in its original historical context, but not in its new canonical context within the book of Deuteronomy. Thus, it will be different from the canonical approach whose object is the final form of the text.¹⁵⁵ As we shall see, there is sufficient evidence to analyse the passages dealing with the exclusion of Moses into different strata.

The exegetical approach used in this study will be diachronic.¹⁵⁶ First, the original form of the text will be determined with the operation of textual criticism.¹⁵⁷ Second, the Hebrew text will then be translated according to the putative original version(s) of the text. Third, the demarcation of the passages will be determined.

¹⁵⁵ Brevard S. Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* (London: SCM, 1979), 74-76.

¹⁵⁶ However, this study knows that it is difficult to strictly separate the diachronic approach from the synchronic approach because traditional historical criticism is never purely diachronic. The historical critic starts from the evidence of the existing text and uses the synchronic evidence for the preferability of a reading. Also, strictly synchronic study is available only for a contemporary text, but even fully contemporary synchronic description is dependent on much information given by diachronic study. For the Hebrew Bible an absolute synchronic analysis would be impossible. James Barr also argues that the synchronic aspect in F. de Saussure's linguistics does not provide sufficient arguments in favour of a synchronic approach to biblical exegesis or against a diachronic one. See James Barr, "The Synchronic, the Diachronic and the Historical: A Triangular Relationship?," in *Bible and Interpretation: The Collected Essays of James Barr. Vol. II: Biblical Studies* (ed. J. Barton; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 151-163. Barr's essay first published in *Synchronic or Diachronic? A Debate on Method in Old Testament Exegesis* (ed. Johannes C. de Moor; OTS 34; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 1-14.

¹⁵⁷ For the procedures of textual criticism, see Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2d ed.; Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2001), 290-291; Ernst Würthwein, *The Text of the Old Testament: an Introduction to Biblia Hebraica* (trans. E. F. Rhodes; 2d ed.; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1995), 113-120.

Fourth, the structure, the literary genre and redactional context of the text will be detected by textual analysis. This study also presupposes that the hypothetical original text would have been internally coherent. In such an approach, the literary integrity of the text will be investigated. Fifth, different textual layers will be separated if necessary. It will neither smooth out all differences between the layers in Deuteronomy nor entail a kind of harmonisation. How can the later layers be detected? Similar words, styles, and phrases can be the grounds for identification of the same author. But there will be some uncertainties because the later redactors can try to reproduce the “phraseological colouring” of their models.¹⁵⁸ Ideas, social background, and historical allusions can help to detect the work of redactors.¹⁵⁹ Thus a younger layer will consist of a different idea or theology although it uses the same phraseology and style. This study will look for the evidence and weigh the probabilities of different options. The literary growth of the text will be traced only if it is judged to be important and relevant to the understanding of the text. The questions of dating and related historical events will be clarified as necessary, but they are not the aim of this study.

Plan of the dissertation

There are nine chapters in this dissertation. The next chapter will deal with the

¹⁵⁸ T. K. Cheyne, “Prophetic Literature,” *EncBib*: 3899. Although Cheyne’s article is related to prophetic literature, his principle can also be applied to the Pentateuch.

¹⁵⁹ Cheyne, “Prophetic Literature,” 3899.

diachronic order of the texts. Although the scholarly consensus is that Deut 4* and Deut 32:48-52 are later than Deut 1-3*, we will still carry out an investigation of the chronological order of the passages in order to avoid from bringing a predetermined system into the texts. We will examine the evidence for Deut 32:48-52 as an insertion to the book of Deuteronomy, and that for Deut 4* as an addition to Deut 1-3*. The order of Deut 31:2 and Deut 34:4-5 will also be determined. In the second part of Chapter Two, we will argue that there is an uniting of traditions of (Num 20:12 and Num 20:24) in Num 27:12-14. In addition, we will look at the evidence for the reworking of Num 27:12-14 in Deut 32:48-52.

Chapter Three will be reviews of scholarship. First we will look at the Priestly nature of Num 20:1-13; 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52. The post-Priestly tradition of these three passages can clarify their sources. Then, there will be reviews on the main studies of divine anger, and of sanctifying God. This order is placed according to the order that we found related to the exclusion of Moses. In Deut 1-4* we first observe divine anger is connected to the ban of Moses from the Promised Land. Then in Deut 32:48-52 we find that the sin of failing to sanctify God is linked to Moses' exclusion.

Chapter Four will argue that Moses was innocent in the spy story of Deut 1. The reason for anger of YHWH on Moses in Deut 1-3* will be compared with that in the whole book of Deuteronomy. Could divine anger also be understood in the reference frame of the Deuteronomistic work? It will be worthy of attempting to explore in this

direction.

Chapter Five will attempt to understand the anger of YHWH in Deut 4* with reference to the frame of the Deuteronomistic History. We will discuss how the Deuteronomists use the exclusion of Moses to compare to the destruction and scattering of the Israelites with the theme of divine anger in the Deuteronomistic History.

Chapter Six will investigate the sin of Moses in Num 20 and 27. The rewriting in Deut 32:48-52 is discussed in Chapter Seven but not in Chapter Six because it belongs to a stage which is different from that of Num 20 and Num 27, and also because of its emphasis on “sanctifying God.” We will look at how the sin of Moses is rewritten in Deut 32:48-52 and also observe the relational dimension of regarding God as holy in Deut 32.

Then, Chapter Eight will discuss the two passages (Deut 31:2; 34:4-5) which do not give any explicit explanation to the exclusion of Moses. Finally, Chapter Nine will conclude this dissertation by summarizing the results of this study.

Chapter Two The Diachronic Order of the Texts

1. The Diachronic Order of the Deuteronomic Texts

In this section the relative chronology of the Deuteronomic texts will be determined. It will begin with the evidence for Deut 32:48-52 as a later supplement to the book of Deuteronomy.¹ Next, it will turn to an examination of the relationship between Deut 1-3* and the main part of Deut 5-26.² The chronological relationship between these two passages (Deut 1-3 and Deut 32:48-52) will be constructed. Then, the relative chronology of the other three chapters (Deut 4, Deut 31 and Deut 34) will be estimated. Finally we can arrange the chronological order of the Deuteronomic texts. But before the determination of the chronological order, we will first have a look at a summary of scholars' proposals which illustrate that Deuteronomy is formed as the result of a cumulative process in which different layers of traditions were added into it.

Scholars' observations and proposals on the editions of Deuteronomy

The structure of Deuteronomy may imply that it has several editions. In his

¹ I begin with the discussion of Deut 32:48-52 rather than that of Deut 1-3 because the evidence for Deut 32:48-52 as an insertion are clearer.

² The expression "main part of Deut 5-26" does admit the possibility that there are numerous later additions and redactions in the core of the book. Martin Noth sees the law core formed by accumulation of various additions. See Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 32.

doctoral thesis,³ de Wette showed that Deuteronomy deviated in form and content from the books of Genesis to Numbers in so many respects that it could only derive from another, later period.⁴ Since the main focus of the Deuteronomic law is about a centralization of the cult, and the historical context of the attempt to centralize the cult was the time of king Josiah,⁵ de Wette fixes the date of composition of the book of Deuteronomy at the time of Josiah.⁶ But this original form of Deuteronomy is different from our Deuteronomy in its present form and extent.⁷ Therefore, from the original form of the book at the time of Josiah to the final form of the book at the time of canonization of the Pentateuch,⁸ there is a development of the book of

³ De Wette, *Dissertatio*.

⁴ De Wette observes that Deuteronomy repeats Lev 26 in a different style, then he draws the conclusion that Deuteronomy stems from a different author. He also lists a number of words and expressions that do not appear in the Tetrateuch. See Thomas Römer, “‘Higher Criticism’: The Historical and Literary-critical Approach – with Special Reference to the Pentateuch,” in *Hebrew Bible/ Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation Vol. III/1 From Modernism to Post-Modernism, The Nineteenth Century – a Century of Modernism and Historicism* (ed. Magne Sæbø; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 395; Smend, *Astruc*, 48.

⁵ See Römer, “Higher Criticism,” 395-396. The connection between Deuteronomy and the law book on which Josiah’s reform was based was already recognized by Chrysostom, Jerome and Athanasius. See A. Weiser, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (trans. D. M. Barton; London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1962), 127.

⁶ Smend, *Astruc*, 48. There are scholars who disagree with de Wette. For instance, Griffiths argues that the linguistic and archaeological evidence revealed that the vast majority of laws found in Deuteronomy could not have stemmed from the time of King Josiah. See J. S. Griffiths, *The Problem of Deuteronomy* (London: SPCK, 1911). Östreicher contests the idea that the work restricted the liturgy to a single location. See Theodor Östreicher, *Das deuteronomische Grundgesetz* (Gütersloh: Der Rufer, 1923). Welch ascribes the Deuteronomic law to the time of Samuel. See Adam C. Welch, *The Code of Deuteronomy* (London: James Clarke & Co., 1924). Hölscher argues that the Deuteronomic law would have been unworkable in Josiah’s time. He dates it to the post-exilic period. See Gustav Hölscher, “Komposition und Ursprung des Deuteronomiums,” *ZAW* 40 (1922), 161-225. See T. C. Vriente and A. S. van der Woude, *Ancient Israelite and Early Jewish Literature* (trans. B. Doyle; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2005), 153.

⁷ John W. Rogerson, *W. M. L. de Wette Founder of Modern Biblical Criticism: An Intellectual Biography* (JSOTSup 126; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 58.

⁸ The biblical text had largely stabilized by the second century CE. This is reflected in the textual evidence from the Dead Sea Scrolls and the development of early rabbinic midrash, much of which presupposes a stable text. See Marc Zvi Brettler, “The Canonization of the Bible,” in *The Jewish Study Bible* (ed. A. Berlin and M. Z. Brettler; 2d ed; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 2157; Timothy H. Lim, *The Formation of the Jewish Canon* (AYBRL; New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2013), 179-80.

Deuteronomy.

Later, Deut 32:48-51(52) is identified as a Priestly text in the outer frame of Deuteronomy by Theodor Nöldeke.⁹ After that Kleinert recognizes the difference between the narrative framework (Deut 1-11) and the legal core (Deut 12-26).¹⁰ Julius Wellhausen follows Graf's opinion, and argues that Deuteronomy was older than the Priestly Code.¹¹ In connection with Nöldeke's previous view, it implies that the P verses in the outer-frame of Deuteronomy were later additions to the book. Based on these above opinions and the classical documentary hypothesis,¹² biblical scholars suggest that Deuteronomy was formed either as an addition of two "editions," or as a gradual development in different stages over different periods of time.¹³

Martin Noth gives a new understanding of the editions of Deuteronomy. His thesis is that the Deuteronomistic History (Deuteronomy to Kings) was written by an

⁹ Theodor Nöldeke, *Untersuchungen zur Kritik des Alten Testaments* (Kiel: Schwerts'sche Buchhandlung, 1869), 93-94, 144; Eckart Otto, "The Integration of the Post-Exilic Book of Deuteronomy into the Post-Priestly Pentateuch," in *The Post-Priestly Pentateuch: New Perspectives on its Redactional Development and Theological Profiles* (ed. F. Giuntoli and K. Schmid; FAT 101; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 332.

¹⁰ Otto Kaiser, *Introduction to the Old Testament: A Presentation of its Results and Problems* (trans. J. Sturdy; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1975), 118.

¹¹ Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel* (trans. J. S. Black and A. Menzies; Edinburgh: Black, 1885), 375-376; trans. of *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels* (Berlin: G. Reimer, 1883), 399.

¹² Vriente expresses the classical documentary hypothesis concisely: the hypothesis proposes the existence of a Yahwistic document (J) stemming from Judah, which was later combined by a redactor with fragments of an Elohist source (E) stemming from the Northern Kingdom. Deuteronomy (D) was added at a later stage and the thus created JED was finally combined with a once independent Priestly code (P). See Vriente, *Jewish Literature*, 171.

¹³ For the discussion, see A. Weiser, *Introduction*, 130. Some scholars, for instance, Abraham Kuenen, Samuel Driver and Alfred Bertholet all propose that Deut was formed in several editions. See Abraham Kuenen, *An Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch* (trans. P. H. Wicksteed; London: Macmillan, 1886), 102, 123, 269-270, 313-314, 319, 337; Driver, *Deuteronomy*, lxxvii; A. Bertholet, *Deuteronomium* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1899), xxiv-xxv.

author who brought material from highly varied traditions together, and arranged them according to a carefully conceived plan.¹⁴ The book of Deuteronomy, according to Noth, is not originally connected to Genesis-Numbers before the exile, but is the beginning of the Deuteronomistic History.¹⁵ Noth observes that Deut 1-3(4) has nothing particular in common with the Deuteronomic law;¹⁶ and the history of the Mosaic period does not seem intended to illustrate various admonitions and warnings, but rather is obviously narrated out of interest in the reported events themselves.¹⁷ Hence, Noth claims that Deut 1-3(4) was written as the introduction of the Deuteronomistic History.¹⁸

Noth hypothesizes that the book of Deuteronomy was formed in three stages: Firstly, Deut 4:44-30:20 (*Urdeuteronomium*) was first formed between the eighth to seventh century BCE.¹⁹ Secondly, the Deuteronomistic work was formed around the middle of the sixth century BCE.²⁰ Deut 1-3(4) was written as the introduction of the whole history. In addition, the narrative part of Deut 31-34 was also formed in this stage.²¹ Finally, the Priestly redactors appended Deuteronomy to the Tetrateuch to

¹⁴ Martin Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History* (trans. J. Doull et al.; JSOTSup 15; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1981; 2d ed., 1991); trans. of *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien: Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1943; 2d repr. ed., 1957; 3d repr. ed.: Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1967).

¹⁵ Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 28.

¹⁶ Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 29.

¹⁷ Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 29.

¹⁸ Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 29, 33. Noth is not sure about the time of formation of 4:1-40. Part of Deut 4 can be attributed to the Deuteronomist, and part can be seen as a later addition. See Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 57-59.

¹⁹ Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 31-32; Thomas Römer, *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical and Literary Introduction* (London: T&T Clark and New York: Continuum 2005; 2d ed., 2007), 24.

²⁰ Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 27.

²¹ Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 60.

form the Pentateuch with Deuteronomy as its conclusion in the postexilic period,²² at that time Deut 31:14, 15 and 23 were added.²³ For Noth, there is no trace of the original P narrative between Num 27:12-23 and Deut 34:1a.²⁴ Deut 32:48-52 is a “secondary repetition” of Num 27:12-14 (for Noth, it is a Priestly text).²⁵ This repetition is necessary because the account of the death of Moses in Deut 34 is “so widely separated” from the announcement of his death in Num 27:12-14 by numerous passages between them.²⁶ Thus, Noth’s three-stage hypothesis of the formation of the book of Deuteronomy is very clear.

Noth’s model is widely accepted by scholars.²⁷ Some of them modify his model in various aspects. For instance, Thomas Römer suggests that the book of Deuteronomy develops into its present shape after the “threefold editions” of the whole Deuteronomistic History.²⁸ According to Römer, Deut 1-3, Deut 4 and Deut

²² Levinson, “Deuteronomy,” 359; Braulik, *Deuteronomium II*, 13.

²³ Martin Noth, *The Chronicler’s History* (trans. H. G. M. Williamson; JSOTSup 50; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987), 146; trans. of *Überlieferungsgeschichte Studien, Teil 2* (2d ed; Halle: Niemeyer, 1957).

²⁴ Noth, *Chronicler’s History*, 129. For Noth, Deut 1:3 and 32:48-52 are not Priestly text. See Martin Noth, *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions* (trans. B. W. Anderson; Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972), 19; trans. of *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch* (2d ed; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1948).

²⁵ Noth, *Chronicler’s History*, 121, 147.

²⁶ Noth, *Chronicler’s History*, 121.

²⁷ For the reactions to Noth’s hypothesis, see Gary N. Knoppers, “Theories of the Redaction(s) of Kings,” in *The Books of Kings: Sources, Composition, Historiography and Reception* (ed. André Lemaire and Baruch Halpern; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010), 69-88; Steven L. McKenzie, *The Trouble with Kings: the Composition of the book of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History* (VTSup 42; Leiden: Brill, 1991), 1-18; Thomas Römer, “Deuteronomistic History,” *EBR* 6:648-653; idem, ed., *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2000); Albert de Pury, Thomas Römer and Jean-Daniel Macchi, eds., *Israel Constructs its History: Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research* (JSOTSup 306; Sheffield Academic Press, 2000). There is no lack of divergent views, for instance, Auld reads Joshua and Judges as individual works, and Samuel-Kings as a single narrative of monarchic period. He observes that Joshua finished unproblematically, while the opening of 1 Samuel offers a good introduction to everything that follows. Judges may be read as a secondary link between Joshua and Samuel-Kings. See A. Graeme Auld, *Joshua Retold: Synoptic Perspectives* (OTS; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 149.

²⁸ The threefold editions are: First edition: around 600 BCE in the period of Josiah; Second edition:

32:48-52 are products of different periods. Other scholars such as Andrew Mayes,²⁹ William Moran,³⁰ Richard Nelson³¹ all agree that Deuteronomy was formed in the framework of the Deuteronomistic work, but they explain the formation of the book of Deuteronomy in more intricate details.³² For the scholars who do not agree with the model of the Deuteronomistic History, they also propose “multi-stages” formation model of Deuteronomy, such as Karin Finsterbusch suggests a “three main stages” model,³³ and Eckart Otto a “five stages” model.³⁴ Although they propose

early exilic; Third edition: early post-exilic period. The first Josianic edition contains Deut 6-28*, Josh 5-12*, 1 Sam 1-2 Sam 8*, 1 Kgs 3-11* and a relatively brief chronicles of the Israelites and Judean kings in 1 Kgs 12:1-2 Kgs 23:15*. The second edition can be read as the first continuous Deuteronomistic History work. It is a crisis literature which records and explains the downfall of Jerusalem. The passages with the theme of the conquest of the land and the loss of the land were inserted to the Josianic version. Deut 1-3 and other passages (Deut 5; 17-18; 31:1-8; 34:1-6*; Josh 1; 3-4; 6-7; 10-11*; 23; Judg 2-11*; 1 Sam 7-8; 10:17-27; 12; 15; 1 Kgs 2:1-4; 3:1-15; 8:1-9:9; 11*; 16:23-34; 21*; 22:39-54; 2 Kgs 1:1-2, 17-18*; 3:1-3; 8:16-29; 9:1-10:36; 11-12*; 17; 21-25*) were formed in this version. In the third post-exilic edition, three main themes are introduced. Firstly, the people of YHWH were asked to separate from their neighbours. Secondly, the idea of monotheism was formed. Thirdly, the horizon was extended over and beyond the Babylonian Gola when the Jewish Diaspora spread. Deut 4 and other passages (Deut 7; 10:14-22; 12:20-28; 14*; 23:1-9; 30:1-14; Josh 22:9-34; 23:4-12; 1 Kgs 8*; 2 Kgs 25:27-30) were added in this edition. Later, when Deuteronomy was cut off from the books of the former prophets, and was attached to the Tetateuch to form the Torah (Pentateuch), Deut 32-34* and other passages (Josh 2; 24; Judg 1:1-2:5; 13-16; 17-21; 1 Sam 2*; 4-6; 2 Sam 21-24; 1 Kgs 13; 17-2 Kgs 7*) were added. Römer called this transformation of the book of Deuteronomy as the end of the Deuteronomistic History. See Römer, *So-Called*, 45-182. A summary of Thomas Römer’s “threefold editions” can be found in Walter Dietrich, “Historiography in the Old Testament,” in *Hebrew Bible/ Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation, Vol. III: From Modernism to Post-Modernism, Part 2: The Twentieth Century- From Modernism to Post-Modernism* (ed. Magne Sæbø; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015), 484-85.

²⁹ A. D. H. Mayes, *The Story of Israel between Settlement and Exile* (London: SCM, 1983), 37-39. Mayes clarifies that more passages (Deut 4:1-40; 6-11*; 26:16-19; 27:9-10; 28; 29-30 and 32:45-47) were formed in the exilic stage. See Mayes, *Story*, 39.

³⁰ Moran, “Deuteronomy,” 257.

³¹ Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 4.

³² Another similar but much simplified three-stages formation can be found in Bernard Levinson who suggests that in the first stage (pre-exilic), Deut 12-26, 28 was framed by a simple introduction and conclusion. In the second stage (exilic), when Deuteronomy was incorporated into the Deuteronomistic History, Deut 1:1-4:40; 31-34 and some passages (Deut 4:25-31; 28:47-47; 30:1-10) were added. In the last stage (post-exilic), the Priestly editors appended Deuteronomy to the newly formed Pentateuch to serve as its conclusion. The Priestly section in Deut 32:48-52 was also added in this last period. See Levinson, “Deuteronomy,” *OEB* 1: 196.

³³ Finsterbusch, “Deuteronomy,” *OEBT* 1: 219.

³⁴ Otto’s model will be discussed in more detail in part three of this dissertation. Otto does not follow Noth’s hypothesis because he thinks that the two revised models (the “layer-model” and the “block-model”) of Deuteronomistic History have not succeeded in correlating the literary layers of

different models with the former scholars, they also agree that the book of Deuteronomy reached its final form by means of various redactional activities. Therefore our present study will also follow this main stream consensus and investigate the passages of the exclusion of Moses in the perspectives of several main editions. Deut 4 and Deut 32:48-52 are later than Deut 1-3 in their understandings.

The evidence for Deut 32:48-52 as an insertion to the book of Deuteronomy

Is there any internal evidence for Deut 32:48-52 as a late text? When we look at the context of Deut 32:48-52, we find that there is no direct relationship between Deut 32:48-52 and the song of Moses (Deut 32:1-43). The song is mentioned in Deut 31:19, 21, 22; introduced in Deut 31:30; and concluded in Deut 32:44. According to Deut 32:45-47, it is said that Moses has finished speaking all the words to all Israel. It is a conclusion which echoes both Deut 31:1 and Deut 1:1 by similar phraseology:

אלה הדברים אשר דבר משה אל כל ישראל...	Deut 1:1
וילך משה וידבר את הדברים האלה אל כל ישראל	Deut 31:1
ויכל משה לדבר את כל הדברים האלה אל כל ישראל	Deut 32:45

Deuteronomy with those of Deuteronomistic History. He points out that Deuteronomy has firm links to the Book of Joshua but not to 1 Samuel to 2 Kings. See Eckart Otto, "The Pentateuch in Synchronical and Diachronical Perspectives: Protorabbinic Scribal Erudition Mediating Between Deuteronomy and the Priestly Code," in *Das Deuteronomium zwischen Pentateuch und Deuteronomistischem Geschichtswerk* (ed. R. Achenbach and E. Otto; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 25. Otto claims that there was already a pre-exilic Deuteronomistic History in 1 Samuel to 2 Kings. Besides, the basic literary layer of Deut1-3 was closely connected with Book of Joshua, but not with other books of the Former Prophets. This observation contradicts the assumption that Deut 1-3 was the introduction to an exilic DtrH from Deut 1 to 2 Kgs 25. See Eckart Otto, "Deuteronomy Between the Pentateuch and the Deuteronomistic History: Some Remarks about Thomas Römer, *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History*," *JHS* 9 (2009): 22-27. Otto mentions that it became increasingly obvious that Deut 1-3 could not be the Deuteronomistic introduction for a DtrH. See Otto, "Integration," 334.

The name Moses (מֹשֶׁה), the verb (דָּבַר), the direct object (אֱלֹהֵי הַדְּבָרִים), and the preposition with the indirect object (אֵל כָּל יִשְׂרָאֵל) all occur in these three verses.

Hence, the main speeches of Moses are concluded in Deut 32:45-47. Regarding Deut 32:48-52, it does not mention either “the song” or “these words” of Moses, but it introduces the motif of “the death of Moses” which is related to the blessings of Moses (Deut 33) and the burial of Moses (Deut 34).

Textual evidence

Although there are thirty four or thirty five manuscripts of Deuteronomy found in the Judaean Desert,³⁵ the passage Deut 32:48-52 is absent in all these texts.³⁶ 4QDeut^q contains Deut 32:1-43 only,³⁷ without its narrative conclusion (Deut 43:44) and the words of YHWH to Moses (Deut 32:48-52). But the majority of Quman manuscripts of Deuteronomy are fragmentary and some only contain a few words or

³⁵ The 34-35 manuscripts include: thirty or thirty one Hebrew manuscripts from the Qumran caves; one Greek manuscript also from Qumran; three other Hebrew copies were from Wadi Murabba'at, Nahal Hever/ Wadi Seiyal, and Masada. See S. White Crawford, “Sample editions of the Oxford Hebrew Bible: Deuteronomy 32:1-9, 1 Kings 11:1-8, and Jeremiah 27:1-10 (34 G),” *VT* 58 (2008): 353; idem, “Textual criticism of the book of Deuteronomy and the Oxford Hebrew Bible project,” in *Seeking out the wisdom of the ancients: essays offered to honor Michael V. Fox on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday* (ed. Ronald L. Troxel et al.; Winona Lake, Ind: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 317; idem, “Reading Deuteronomy in the Second Temple Period,” in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library. The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretations* (ed. K. de Troyer and A. Lange; Atlanta: SBL, 2005), 127; Timothy H. Lim, “Deuteronomy in the Judaism of the Second Temple Period,” in *Deuteronomy in the New Testament* (ed. Maarten J. J. Menken and S. Moyise; London: Continuum, 2007), 9-10. See also J. A. Dacan, “Deuteronomy, Book of,” *EDSS* 1:198-220; F. García Martínez, “Les manuscrits du désert de Juda et le Deutéronome,” in *Studies in Deuteronomy: in honour of C J Labuschagne on the occasion of his 65th birthday* (ed. F. García Martínez et al.; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 64-65.

³⁶ García Martínez, “Les manuscrits,” 82; Eugene C. Ulrich, ed., *The Biblical Qumran scrolls: transcriptions and textual variants* (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 242-243.

³⁷ Crawford, “Reading Deuteronomy,” 128.

verses,³⁸ the absence of Deut 32:48-52 in the Dead Sea Scrolls does not form a strong argument in supporting that it is a later insertion. Furthermore, other important textual traditions of Deuteronomy such as the Codex Vaticanus, the Codex Alexandrinus, the Aleppo Codex, and the Leningrad Codex contain Deut 32:48-52.³⁹ Therefore Deut 32:48-52 can be regarded as an integral part of the final form of the book of Deuteronomy.

However, Deut 32:48-52 does contain features that suggest that it may not be by the same hand as the Deuteronomists. There are three considerations which support that Deut 32:48-52 is a secondary addition to the book of Deuteronomy: stylistic, factual and theological differences, and to these we now turn.

Stylistic evidence

1) “the land of Canaan” (Deut 32:49)

Phrase	Occurrence in the Pentateuch
ארץ כנען	Gen 17:8; 45:25; Exod 6:4; 16:35; Lev 14:34; 18:3; 25:38; Num 13:2, 17; 32:32; 33:51; 34:2
ארץ כנען	Deut 32:49
ארץ הכנעני	Deut 1:7; 11:30

In Deut 32:49 the land is called the “land of Canaan,” while in Deut 1:7 and 11:30, the land is called the “land of the Canaanites.” This term “land of Canaan,” however,

³⁸ For instance, the largest segment (4QDeut^a) is only 34 verses. See Crawford, “Deuteronomy and the Oxford Hebrew Bible project,” 316.

³⁹ David N. Freedman, Astrid B. Beck and James A. Sanders, eds., *The Leningrad Codex: a facsimile edition* (Grand Rapids, Mich. ; Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1998); Hayim Tawil, *Crown of Aleppo: the Mystery of the oldest Hebrew Bible Codex* (Philadelphia, Pa.: Jewish Publication Society, 2010), 116; Würthwein, *Text of the Old Testament*, 36.

occurs twelve times in Gen-Num. Thus Deut 32:49 contains a term which is commonly used in the Tetrateuch but not in Deuteronomy.

2) “(the land) that I, I am giving” (Deut 32:49, 52)

Phrase	Occurrence in the Pentateuch
אשר אני נתן	Lev 23:10; 25:2
אשר אני נתן	Deut 32:49, 52
אשר נשבעתי	Deut 10:11; 31:21, 23; 34:4
אשר יהוה אלהיך נתן	Deut 16:20; 17:14; 18:9; 24:4; 26:1; 27:2, 3
אשר יהוה אלהיכם נתן	Deut 3:20; 11:31
אשר יהוה אלהינו נתן	Deut 1:25; 2:29

In Deut 32:49 and 52 the land is modified by “that I, I am giving.” However, in other direct speeches of YHWH in Deuteronomy, such as Deut 10:11; 31:21, 23; and 34:4, the verb which follows the “that” is not נתן (“I am giving”), but נשבעתי (“I swore”).

The Qal participle of נתן can be found only when YHWH is depicted as a third person, i.e. not in God’s direct speech, in the book of Deuteronomy. The same relative clause “which I, I am giving” can be found in Lev 23:10; 25:2. Therefore, Deut 32:49 and 52 may have a greater affinity to Lev 23:10; 25:2 than to the book of Deuteronomy.

3) “for a possession” (Deut 32:49)

Phrase	Occurrence in the Pentateuch
לאחזה	Lev 14:34; Num 32:5, 22
לאחזה	Deut 32:49

לאחזה	No other occurrence in Deuteronomy
-------	------------------------------------

The Promised Land in Deuteronomy is never further modified by the phrase “for a possession” except in Deut 32:49. But this modifier can be found in Lev 14:34; Num 32:5, 22. Hence, Deut 32:49 uses a style more similar in Leviticus and Numbers than Deuteronomy.⁴⁰

4) “you will be gathered to your people” and “and he was gathered to his people” (Deut 32:50)

Phrase	Occurrence in the Pentateuch
והאסף אל עמיו	No other occurrence in the Pentateuch ⁴¹
והאסף אל עמיו	Deut 32:50
שכב עם אבותיו	Deut 31:16

Phrase	Occurrence in the Pentateuch
ויאסף אל עמיו	Gen 25:8, 17; 35:29; 49:33
ויאסף אל עמיו	Deut 32:50
שם מת אהרן ויקבר שם	Deut 10:6

When YHWH commanded Moses to die, according to Deut 32:50, the clause used is “and be gathered to your people” which is different from “you will lie down with your fathers” in Deut 31:16. When the narrator said that Aaron was dead, according to Deut 32:50, the clause is “and he was gathered to his people.” However, in Deut 10:6, the verbs “died” and “was buried” are used; it is not said that Aaron “was

⁴⁰ The word אחזה (“possession”) occurs 38 times in Genesis-Numbers, but only once in Deuteronomy: Gen 17:8; 23:4, 9, 20; 36:43; 47:11; 48:4; 49:30; 50:13; Lev 14:34 (2×); 25:10, 13, 24, 25, 27, 28, 32, 33 (2×), 34, 41, 45, 46; 27:16, 21, 22, 24, 28; Num 27:4, 7; 32:5, 22, 29, 32; 35:2, 8, 28; Deut 32:49.

⁴¹ In Gen 49:29, we can find אני נאסף אל עמי (“I am to be gathered to my people”).

gathered to his people.” The clause “and he was gathered to his people” can be found in Gen 25:8, 17; 35:29; 49:33, which depicts the death of Abraham, Ishmael, Isaac, and Jacob. Thus the same “formula” is used to depict Aaron’s death. The phrase “gathered to your/ his people” occurs only two times in Deuteronomy (2× in Deut 32:50). This phrase is different from the phrase “lie down with your/ his fathers” (e.g. in Deut 31:16) which occurs many times in the book of Kings,⁴² but never in the Tetratauch.

5) “in the midst of the Israelites” (Deut 32:51)

Phrase	Occurrence in the Pentateuch
בתוך בני ישראל	Exod 29:45; Lev 22:32; 24:10; 25:33; Num 1:49; 2:33; 9:7; 18:20, 24; 26:62(2×); 35:34
בתוך בני ישראל	Deut 32:51(2×)
לעני כל ישראל	Deut 31:7; 34:12

According to Deut 32:51, we have “in the midst of the Israelites,” while in Deut 31:7; 34:12, we have “before the eyes of all Israel.” The phrase “in the midst of the Israelites” can be found in Exod 29:45; Lev 22:32; 24:10; 25:33; Num 1:49; 2:33; 9:7; 18:20, 24; 26:62(2×); 35:34. This case also shows that Deut 32:51 contains a style which is similar to Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers, but not Deuteronomy.

⁴² 1 Kgs 1:21; 2:10; 11:21, 43; 14:20, 31; 15:8, 24; 16:6, 28; 22:40, 50; 2 Kgs 8:24; 10:35; 13:9, 13; 14:16, 22, 29; 15:7, 22, 38; 16:20; 20:21; 21:18; 24:6.

6) “the waters of Meribath-Kadesh” (Deut 32:51)

Phrase	Occurrence in the Pentateuch
מי מריבת קדש	Num 27:14
מי מריבת קדש	Deut 32:51
מי מריבה	Deut 33:8

Deut 32:51 has the only occurrence of the name “Meribath-Kadesh” in Deuteronomy.

In Deut 33:8, the location is called “the waters of Meribah.” The name

“Meribath-Kadesh” can also be found in Num 27:14. Thus, Deut 32:51 may have a greater affinity with Num 27:14 than Deuteronomy.

7) “because” (Deut 32:51)

Conjunction “because”	Occurrence in the divine sayings in the Pentateuch
על אשר	Num 20:24
על אשר	Deut 32:51 (2×)
כי	Deut 1: 38, 42; 2:5, 9, 19; 3:2, 27, 28; 5:9; 9:12; 31:23; 32:20, 22

There are twenty-nine divine sayings in the book of Deuteronomy.⁴³ In these sayings when YHWH explains something or gives the reason for something, He usually uses the conjunction כי (“because,” which occurs thirteen times). The conjunction אשר על (“because”) only occurs in Deut 32:51 and Num 20:24.

⁴³ Deut 1:6-8; 1:35-36; 1:37-40; 1:42; 2:3-7; 2:9, 13; 2:18-19, 24-25; 2:31; 3:2; 3:26-28; 4:10; 5:6-18; 5:28-31; 9:12; 9:13-14; 9:23; 10:1-2; 10:11; 17:16; 18:17-20; 31:2; 31:14; 31:16-21; 31:23; 32:20-27; 32:37-42; 32:49-52; 33:27; 34:4.

8) Rare words in Deuteronomy

Phrases such as הר העברים “the mountain of the Abarim” (Deut 32:49) and מדבר צן “the wilderness of Zin” (Deut 32:51) do not appear elsewhere in Deuteronomy. There are references to “the mountain of the Abarim” in Num 27:12; 33:47, 48. “The wilderness of Zin” occurs six times in the book of Numbers (Num 13:21; 20:1; 27:14[2×]; 33:36; 34:3). Thus Deut 32: 49 and 51 refer to places which are more familiar in the book of Numbers than in Deuteronomy. The following table summarises the above discussions. It can be seen that Deut 32:48-52 has a greater affinity with the book of Numbers and Leviticus than to Deuteronomy itself.

Stylistic similarity between Deut 32:48-52 and other books in the Pentateuch

Example	Deut 32	Phrase/ Clause	Affinity with other books				
			Gen	Exod	Lev	Num	Deut
1	v. 49	ארץ כנען	✓	✓	✓	✓	
2	vv. 49 & 52	אשר אני נתן			✓		
3	v. 49	לאחזה			✓	✓	
4	v. 50	ויאסף אל עמיו	✓				
5	v. 51	בתוך בני ישראל		✓	✓	✓	
6	v. 51	מי מריבת קדש				✓	
7	v. 51	על אשר				✓	
8	vv. 49 & 51	הר העברים מדבר צן				✓	

Factual and theological evidence

There is a remarkable disagreement in the geographic locations between Deut 32:48-52 and the body of Deuteronomy. According to Deut 3:27, YHWH commands

Moses to ascend to the top of Pisgah; while in Deut 32:49, YHWH orders him to go up to the mountain of Abarim which is also called Mount Nebo. Since Mount Pisgah and Mount Nebo are two different places, this discrepancy is also evidence that Deut 3:27 and Deut 32:49 are independent to each other. Besides, according to Deut 32:50, Aaron died on **הַר הָהָר** “Mount Hor.” This information matches the record in Num 20:23-29, but contradicts the death report of Aaron in Deut 10:6-7, according to which Aaron died at **מוֹסֶרָה** “Moserah.”⁴⁴ In addition, according to Deut 32:51 the punishment of Moses was caused by the incident at the waters of Meribath, while in Deut 1:37 Moses was punished in the spy story, which is about 38 years before the incident at the waters of Meribath.

A still weightier consideration is that Deut 32:48-52 has a different theology from that which preceded it. According to Deut 32:51, YHWH said that Moses and Aaron “did not regard (God) as holy.” This is the only case where the verb **קִדַּשׁ** (“to sanctify”) is applied to YHWH as the object in Deuteronomy. The verb **קִדַּשׁ** occurs four times in Deuteronomy.⁴⁵ The objects of this verb are: the Sabbath day (Deut 5:12), every firstborn male of the herd and flock (Deut 15:19), and the fruit of the vineyard (Deut 22:9). Deut 32:51 is the only text in which the verb **קִדַּשׁ** is used with a divine object in the book. The adjective “holy”⁴⁶ and the noun “holiness”⁴⁷ are

⁴⁴ Finsterbusch, *Deuteronomium*, 192.

⁴⁵ All are with human subjects.

⁴⁶ The adjective **קִדְּוֶה** (“holy,” see *HALOT* 2:1066.) occurs seven times in Deuteronomy. Five of them are applied to the people of Israel (Deut 7:6; 14:2, 21; 26:19; 28:9). One is applied to the camp (Deut 23:15; ET 23:14). The remainder in Deut 33:3 is usually translated as “the holy ones,” which can be understood as either a reference to “the holy ones” (the angels) in Deut 33:2 or stands parallel to “his people” in Deut 33:3. See: Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 399. For a treatment on the “holy people” in

neither applied to God in Deuteronomy. Therefore, Deut 32:51 first introduces the concept of sanctifying God in the book.

The above accumulative stylistic, factual, and theological considerations are sufficient to establish that Deut 32:48-52 was not written by the Deuteronomists.

The diachronic relationship between Deut 1-3 and the main body of Deuteronomy

Textual and stylistic evidence

From textual evidence, the book of Deuteronomy was never circulated without Deut 1-3.⁴⁸ These three chapters can be found in the Codex Alexandrinus and the Leningrad Codex.⁴⁹ Most of Deut 1-3 can also be found in the Qumran manuscripts.⁵⁰ Therefore even if it can be argued that Deut 1-3 is an addendum, this addition did not occur after the book of Deuteronomy had reached the first stage of

Deuteronomy, see: Pancratius C. Beentjes, “‘Holy People’: The Biblical Evidence,” in *A Holy People: Jewish and Christian Perspectives on Religious Communal Identity* (ed. M. Poorthuis and J. Schwartz; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 3-8.

⁴⁷ The noun קֹדֶשׁ (“holiness,” see *HALOT* 2:1077.) occurs four times in Deuteronomy. In Deut 12:26, it is used for “the consecrated things.” In Deut 26:13, it is used for “the tithe of the produce in the third year.” In Deut 26:15, it is used for “the holy dwelling place from the heavens.” Finally, “the holy ones” in Deut 33:2 can be interpreted either as the angels or as a place name, “Ribebboth-Kodesh.” Tigay suggests that it may mean “Ribebboth at, or near, Kadesh.” He also mentions that the name could be a variant form of “Meribat-kadesh” in Deut 32:51. See Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 320.

⁴⁸ In this section, “Deut 1-3” just means the main part of Deut 1-3 for the sake of convenience. This does not exclude the possibility that there are insertions in the first three chapters of Deuteronomy.

⁴⁹ Edward M. Thompson ed., *Facsimile of the Codex Alexandrinus*, Vol.1. (London: British Museum, 1881); David N. Freedman, Astrid B. Beck and James A. Sanders, eds., *The Leningrad Codex: a facsimile edition* (Grand Rapids, Mich. ; Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1998).

⁵⁰ Crawford, “Deuteronomy and the Oxford Hebrew Bible project,” 317; García Martínez, “Les manuscrits,” 80; Ulrich, *Biblical Qumran scrolls*, 175-181.

the formation of its final form;⁵¹ also the question must be raised whether it was composed by the same hand or school of Deut 5-26 or by some other.

The style of Deut 1-3 suggests that it was written by the same school as the Deuteronomic law.⁵² Deut 1-3 and Deut 5-26 have the same purpose, same urgency

⁵¹ Emanuel Tov states that theoretically we can divide the formation of the biblical books into two stages: a first stage in which the books were composed, and a second stage during which the text was copied and transmitted. The first stage was completed with the emergence of the finished literary works that are similar to the biblical books now known to us. The second stage began at this point. The biblical books underwent different stages of writing and revision, and these involved a process of copying as well. See Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 199-200.

⁵² Some typical expressions of Deut 5-26 can be found in Deut 1-3. For instance, when speaking about YHWH, the two sections use same expressions: “YHWH our God” or “YHWH your (plural) God” or “YHWH your (singular) God” or “YHWH God of your (singular) father.”

	יהוה אלהינו	YHWH our God
Deut 1-3	1:6, 19, 20, 25, 41; 2:29, 33, 36, 37; 3:3	
Deut 5-26	5:2, 24, 25, 27 (2×); 6:4, 20, 24, 25	

	יהוה אלהיכם	YHWH your (plural) God
Deut 1-3	1:10, 26, 30; 3:18, 20, 21, 22	
Deut 5-26	5:32, 33; 6:1, 16, 17; 8:20; 9:23; 10:17; 11:2, 13, 22, 25, 27, 28, 31; 12:5, 7, 10, 11, 12; 13:4 (2×), 5, 6; 20:4	

	יהוה אלהיך	YHWH your (singular) God
Deut 1-3	1:21, 31; 2:7 (2×), 30	
Deut 5-26	5:6, 9, 11, 12, 15 (2×), 16 (2×); 6:2, 5, 10, 13, 15 (2×); 7:1, 2, 6, 9, 12, 16, 18, 19 (2×), 20, 21, 22, 23, 25; 8:2, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 14, 18, 19; 9:3, 4, 5, 6, 7; 10:9, 12 (3×), 20, 22; 11:1, 12 (2×), 29; 12:7, 9, 15, 18 (3×), 20, 21, 27 (2×), 28, 29; 13:6, 11, 13, 19 (2×); 14:23 (2×), 24 (2×), 25, 26, 29; 15:4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 14, 15, 18, 20; 16:1, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11 (2×), 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22; 17:1, 2 (2×), 8, 12, 14, 15; 18:5, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16; 19:1 (2×), 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 14; 20:1, 13, 14, 16, 17; 21:1, 5, 10, 23; 22:5; 23:6 (3×), 15, 19 (2×), 21, 22; 24:4, 9, 13, 18, 19; 25:15, 16, 19 (2×); 26:1, 2 (2×), 4, 5, 10 (2×), 11, 13, 16	

	יהוה אלהי אבתיך	YHWH God of your (singular) father
Deut 1-3	1:21	
Deut 5-26	6:3; 12:1	

When speaking about the land, the two sections also use same expressions: “the land which YHWH our/ your God gives to us/ you” or “the good land.”

	הארץ/האדמה אשר יהוה אלהינו/אלהיכם/אלהיך נתן לנו/להם/לך
	the land which YHWH our/ your God gives to us/ you
Deut 1-3	1:25; 2:29; 3:20
Deut 5-26	5:16; 11:31; 16:20; 17:14; 18:9; 24:4; 25:15; 26:1

	הארץ הטובה	the good land
--	------------	---------------

and spiritual thoroughness, same directions of religion and ethical emphasis, and same style (such as distinctive prose rhythm, love of hyperbole, and repetition).⁵³

The first two speeches of Moses also agree in details such as characteristic place names, formulae, phrases, and single terms.⁵⁴ Nevertheless, the stylistic evidence *alone* cannot prove that Deut 1-3 and Deut 5-26 are written by the same hand. It should be admitted that unity of style does not prove oneness of authorship because the Deuteronomic style is highly imitable.⁵⁵ Conversely, is there any evidence for an imitation in Deut 1-3? If there is such evidence, Deut 1-3 can be classified as later than the main part of the book of Deuteronomy. Since the *possibility* of imitation itself cannot be used as a proof that the style of Deut 1-3 was secondary, the

Deut 1-3	1:35; 3:25
Deut 5-26	9:6

The phrase “YHWH your God who goes” can be found in both sections.

	יהוה אלהיכם ההלך	YHWH your God who goes
Deut 1-3	1:30, 32-33	
Deut 5-26	20:4	

The relative clause which begins with “which YHWH swore” can be found in both sections.

	אשר נשבע יהוה	which YHWH swore
Deut 1-3	1:8	
Deut 5-26	6:18; 8:1; 9:5; 11:9, 21; 26:3	

Similar wordings can be found in Deut 3:21 and 11:7.

Deut 3:21	your eyes have seen all that YHWH your God has done...
	עיניך הראת את כל אשר עשה יהוה אלהיכם
Deut 11:7	עיניכם הראת את כל מעשה יהוה הגדל אשר עשה
	...your eyes have seen all the great work of YHWH that He did.

⁵³ Smith, *Deuteronomy*, lii-liii. In Deut 1:28 the remark of the people corresponds to the holy war injunction in Deut 20:8 in which it does not permit anyone to participate in battle who will cause his kinsmen's heart to melt. Also, in Deut 1:29 the exhortation is a regular Deuteronomic theme (Deut 7:21; 20:3). See John van Seters, *The Life of Moses: the Yahwist as Historian in Exodus-Numbers* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/ John Knox Press, 1994), 371.

⁵⁴ Smith, *Deuteronomy*, liii-lv.

⁵⁵ Smith, *Deuteronomy*, xlv.

similarity between Deut 1-3 and Deut 5-26 can be stated as a result of imitation only if there are great factual and theological differences between them. There are five reasons to see that Deut 1-3 is later than the main part of the book of Deuteronomy. However, not all of them are conclusive. We shall look at them one by one.

The first reason is an expression in 2 Kgs 22-23. It is widely believed that the book found by Hilkiah during the reign of king Josiah was the core of Deuteronomy (Deut 12-26 or Deut 5-26) or Deuteronomy in some form,⁵⁶ such book might not contain Deut 1-3. According to 2 Kgs 22:8, the book is called ספר התורה (“book of the law” or “the law book”).⁵⁷ This expression presupposes less narrative materials than Deut 1-3.⁵⁸ However, it is doubtful that the occurrence of one single expression, as an external evidence, can give a sufficient reason for excluding Deut 1-3 from the main body of the book. The text of Deuteronomy itself should first give primary evidence for a later addition. Moreover, current research suggests that the reform account of king Josiah consists completely of Deuteronomistic fiction, and consequently such account does not fit as a basis for a critical historiography.⁵⁹

Therefore, the nature of the book found by Hilkiah (as a law code only) should also

⁵⁶ John J. Collins, *The Invention of Judaism: Torah and Jewish identity from Deuteronomy to Paul* (Oakland, Calif.: University of California Press, 2017), 28.

⁵⁷ This expression occurs six times in the Hebrew Bible: Deut 31:26; Josh 1:8; 2 Kgs 22:8, 11; 2 Chr 34:15 and Neh 8:3. The definite article (“the” law book) is used and may indicate that the book was a very familiar document, which had been lost for some time, and now rediscovered; since the law book and its history was so well known, it is natural to use the definite article. See Gwilym H. Jones, *I and 2 Kings* (2 vols; NCBC; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1984), 2:611.

⁵⁸ Georg Fohrer, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (trans. David E. Green; New York: Abingdon, 1968), 169.

⁵⁹ Timo Veijola, “Principal Observations of the Basic Story in Deuteronomy 1-3,” in “*Wünschet Jerusalem Frieden*”: *IOSOT Congress, Jerusalem 1986* (ed. M. Augustin and K.-D. Schunck; BEATAJ 13; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1988), 253; repr. in *A Song of Power and the Power of Song* (ed. D. L. Christensen; SBTS 3; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1993), 143.

be assessed carefully.⁶⁰ This “external evidence” is not a proof that the original Deuteronomy did not contain Deut 1-3.

Second, there is a contradiction on the view of the Israelites between Deut 1-3 and Deut 5-26. The author of Deut 5-26 wishes to identify the second Exodus generation, whom Moses is addressing, with the first Exodus generation who witnessed the Exodus and the miracles in the wilderness (c.f. Deut 5:2-3; 11:2-7).⁶¹ However, Deut 1-3 is particularly anxious to distinguish these two generations. According to Deut 2:14-16, the entire generation of warriors had perished.⁶² This contradiction can be explained in that the difference on the view of Israelites is not of “fact” but of “purpose.”⁶³ Deut 2:14 belongs to the first speech of Moses, the purpose of which is to relate fact; while Deut 5:2-3 and 11:2-7 belong to the second speech in which Israel is treated as a moral whole.⁶⁴ In addition, the dead people of Deut 2:14-16 are limited to the “warriors” (the male adults); and a fair proportion of those under twenty in the second year of the Exodus would be still alive 38 years afterward.⁶⁵ Moreover, Deuteronomy has a practice to comprehend the past, the present, and the future generations of Israel as an ideal unity.⁶⁶ Furthermore, there are some cases where the second Exodus generation is identified with the first

⁶⁰ The discovery report (2 Kgs 22:8, 10, 13*, 16-18, 19*, 20*; 23:1-3) may be inserted by a post-exilic redactor because the book-finding motif is a common concept in ancient literature, and the construction of 2 Kgs 22 is most probably based on this ancient Near Eastern motif. See Römer, *So-Called*, 51.

⁶¹ Kuenen, *Hexateuch*, 121-122.

⁶² Kuenen, *Hexateuch*, 122.

⁶³ Smith, *Deuteronomy*, lvii.

⁶⁴ Smith, *Deuteronomy*, lvii.

⁶⁵ Driver, *Deuteronomy*, lxix.

⁶⁶ Driver, *Deuteronomy*, lxix.

Exodus generation in Deut 1 (see Deut 1:9, 19, 20, 22, 26, 46).⁶⁷ Such identification is common in Deut 5-26. Consequently, there is no contradiction on the view of the Israelites.

Third, one more discrepancy can be found between Deut 1-3 and Deut 5-26. They provide different comments on the action of the Moabites. According to Deut 2:28-29, the Moabites had sold food and water to the Israelites. In Deut 23:5 (4 ET) they did not meet the Israelites with food and water on their way out of Exodus.⁶⁸ There are three ways to look at this problem. Firstly, the two subordinate clauses in Deut 23:5 refer to the Ammonites and Moabites respectively, rather than to the two of them together.⁶⁹ The two clauses have different subjects.⁷⁰ The subject of the first clause “because *they* did not meet you with food and water on the way...” is the Ammonites, while the Moabite is the subject of the second clause “because *he* hired against you Balaam... to curse you.” These two clauses can be treated differently because the first clause is a second person *plural* form address, and the other one is a second person *singular* form, with third person *singular* main verb שכר (“he hired”).

אשר לא קדמו אתכם בלחם ובמים בדרך בצאתכם ממצרים	Deut 23:5a
ואשר שכר עליך את בלעם בן בעור מפתור ארם נהרים לקללך	Deut 23:5b

The second way to look at the discrepancy is that Deut 23:5 can be read as a later insertion,⁷¹ which reflects a variant tradition about Israel’s encounters in

⁶⁷ Driver, *Deuteronomy*, lxix; Smith, *Deuteronomy*, lvii.

⁶⁸ Kuenen, *Hexateuch*, 121-122.

⁶⁹ Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 297; Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 316.

⁷⁰ Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 386, n. 35.

⁷¹ Levinson, “Deuteronomy,” 398; Smith, *Deuteronomy*, lvii; G. Ernest Wright, “Deuteronomy,” 469.

Transjordan.⁷² The perspective of the clause “when you came forth out of Egypt” in Deut 23:5a is a time long after when the whole forty years’ passage from Egypt was foreshortened.⁷³ The secondary addition reinterprets Deut 2:28-29.⁷⁴ Moreover, Deut 2:29 may not aim at giving a true picture of the action of the Moabites. According to the context of Deut 2:26-29, this was a saying of the messengers who were sent by Moses to King Sihon of Heshbon. The implication that Moab actually helped Israel may simply be the rhetoric of war.⁷⁵ Hence, the contradictory comments on the Moabites can be solved by the above three ways of reading.

Fourth, a more crucial reason is the so-called double headings or prologues (Deut 1:1-5 and Deut 4:44-49) and the double introductions (Deut 1:6-4:40 and Deut 5-11). Deut 1-3 can be read as an introduction to the book of Deuteronomy. However, it has already been observed that the Deuteronomic law (Deut 12-26) has its own introduction (Deut 5-11).⁷⁶ Would an author write two introductions for the main part of a book? Deut 5-11 and the Deuteronomic law are written together as the second speech of Moses with Deut 4:44-49 as its prologue; while Deut 1-3 is written as the first speech of Moses also with its superscription in Deut 1:1-5. It does not seem that an author would write two headings and two introductions for the Deuteronomic law (Deut 12-26). Such double headings and introductions may indicate that Deut 1-3 and Deut 5-26 are from different hands. Yet, are there really

⁷² Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 211.

⁷³ Smith, *Deuteronomy*, 270.

⁷⁴ Bultmann, “Deuteronomy,” 207-8.

⁷⁵ McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 349.

⁷⁶ Kuenen, *Hexateuch*, 112-113.

double headings and introductions?

Regarding the headings, no one will deny that there are many similarities between them. They are, however, not the same. One of the differences is the usage of the phrase **והמשפטים והחקים** (“the statutes and the ordinances”). According to Deut 4:45, Moses spoke the decrees, the statutes, and the ordinances to the Israelites. The phrase “the statutes and the ordinances” cannot be found in Deut 1-3 (and so the first heading Deut 1:1-5), but occurs frequently in Deut 5-26.⁷⁷ Such frequent occurrence shows that “the statutes and the ordinances” is a main theme in Deut 5-26. Therefore, Deut 4:44-49 does not repeat Deut 1:1-5, rather it introduces “the statutes and the ordinances” as the nature of the sayings of Moses in Deut 5-26. Deut 1:1-5 does not contain the words “the statutes and the ordinances,” and it cannot be used as an adequate introduction of Deut 5-26. Consequently, Deut 1:1-5 and Deut 4:44-49 are not the same and not interchangeable. Strictly speaking, they are not “double” headings.

With regard to the problem of the double introductions (Deut 1-3 and Deut 5-11), it can be solved by seeing that they have different functions. Deut 1-3 contrasts the first and the second generations of the Israelites on the issue of their obedience to YHWH. The first generation who left Egypt did not believe in God (Deut 1:32) or listen to the words of YHWH (Deut 1:43), then they lost the chance to

⁷⁷ **והמשפטים והחקים** in Deut 6:1; 12:1; **והחקים והמשפטים** in Deut 4:45; 5:31; 6:20; **את החקים ואת המשפטים** in Deut 5:1; 7:11; 11:32; **את החקים האלה ואת המשפטים** in Deut 26:16; **ומשפטי** in Deut 26:17.

enter the Promised Land. On the other hand, the second generation obeyed God's words, and they were given the land of King Sihon and King Og. "Believing in" and "listening to" God is a main theme in Deut 1-3. "Loving God," however, is a new theme brought out by Deut 5-11, according to which the Israelites were told to love YHWH their God (Deut 6:5; 10:12; 11:1, 13, 22). The word "love" does not occur in Deut 1-3, but becomes a vital theme in Deut 5-11. It is the foundation of obeying God's statutes and ordinances (Deut 11:1). Hence there is a difference between Deut 1-3 and Deut 5-11; they cannot be classified as "double" introductions.

The fifth reason is about the hypothesis of Martin Noth who claims that Deut 1-3 has nothing particular in common with the Deuteronomistic law but is directly related to the Deuteronomistic History.⁷⁸ Deut 1-3 is the introduction of the whole historical work, but not the Deuteronomistic law.⁷⁹ The history of the period of wilderness wandering in Deut 1-3 is selected because such history is necessary for the reader to understand the accounts in the Deuteronomistic History.⁸⁰ For example, the spy story in Deut 1:19-46 can provide several functions. First, it anticipates the theme of the conquest of the land which the Deuteronomist propose to treat later in detail.⁸¹ Second, it helps to explain why the wanderings in the wilderness lasted forty years and hence to justify the Deuteronomist's chronology. Third, it provides a

⁷⁸ Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 29.

⁷⁹ Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 29, 32, 33.

⁸⁰ Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 29-30.

⁸¹ The spy story is placed at the very beginning of Moses' historical recapitulation, and provides a paradigm of themes of conquest and loss of the land which run from the book of Joshua to the book of Kings. See Römer, *So-Called*, 125.

motivation for Caleb's special role in the conquest (Josh 14:6-14).⁸²

Although in Deut 1-3 there is no explicit allusion to the law in Deut 5-26,⁸³ we can find implicit linkage between Deut 1-3 and Deut 5-26. The exclusion of Moses is not told in Deut 5-26, but in Deut 1-3. However, Deut 5-26 presupposes the fact that Moses would leave the people before they enter the Promised Land. In Deut 8:1 Moses said that "... you enter and occupy the land," but not "... we enter and occupy the land." Moses has distinguished himself from the Israelites who will enter and take the land. Similar instances can be found in Deut 11:8, 31. These sayings are intelligible only if the context of Moses' exclusion from the Promised Land is known.

In addition, Moses never claimed that he brought the Israelites into the land, but always said that "YHWH your God" brought them into the land. It is very clear that Moses would not continue to be the leader who could bring the Israelites into the land. Such consciousness of divine leading can also be found in Deut 6:10; 7:1; 8:7; 9:4; 11:29. It is fair to say that these sayings presuppose the exclusion of Moses as depicted in Deut 1-3.

Furthermore, we have discussed that the style of Deut 1-3 matches that of the main part of the book. Hence, there is no denying that Deut 1-3 can still perform as an introduction of the book of Deuteronomy.⁸⁴ This dissertation will take the view

⁸² Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 50.

⁸³ Veijola, "Principal Observations," 143.

⁸⁴ For a different view on the function of Deut 1-3, see Jan Christian Gertz, "The Partial Composition," in *T&T Clark Handbook of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Literature*,

that Deut 1-3, providing the background information for both the Deuteronomic law and the Deuteronomistic History, performs the two roles together, and it is the introduction to these two parts.⁸⁵

The argument of the parallel structure to the ancient Near Eastern vassal treaty

In defense of the idea that Deuteronomy is a unity, it has been argued that the structure of Deuteronomy can be outlined as the major component parts of the ancient Near Eastern vassal treaty:⁸⁶

1. Preamble (Deut 1:1-5)
2. Historical Prologue (Deut 1:6-4:49)
3. General Stipulations (Deut 5-11)
4. Specific Stipulations (Deut 12-26)
5. Curses and Blessings with exhortation (Deut 27-30)

Religion and History of the Old Testament (trans. Peter Altmann; London/New York: T&T Clark International, 2012), 316; Jan Christian Gertz, "Kompositorische Funktion und literarhistorischer Ort von Deuteronomium 1-3," in *Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke: Redaktions- und religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur "Deuteronomismus"-Diskussion in Tora und Vorderen Propheten* (ed. M. Witte et al.; BZAW 365; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2006), 103-123. Jan C. Gertz questions that the Deuteronomistic History begins with Deut 1-3. He views Deut 1-3 as interpretative recapitulations or rereading (*Relecture*) of the preceding non-Priestly narratives that are formulated in response to the insertion of Deuteronomy into the narrative context of exodus and the conquest. The older and originally independent Deuteronomic law can be integrated into Pentateuch by such process. Gertz's arguments are examined by Blum. See Erhard Blum, "Pentateuch-Hexateuch-Enneateuch? Or: How Can One Recognize a Literary Work in the Hebrew Bible?," in *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, or Enneateuch?: Identifying Literary Works in Genesis through Kings* (ed. T. B. Dozeman et al.; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 65-67.

⁸⁵ It is also possible that the prior insertion of Deut 1-3 before Deut 5-26 can contribute to the demarcation of the books. The fiction of the retrospect in Deut 1-3 creates the presupposition for regarding Deuteronomy in Deuteronomy itself and in Joshua-Kings as an independent normative book of law. See Kratz, *Composition*, 128.

⁸⁶ Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 24.

6. Witnesses and Provisions for the continuity of covenant and a successor for Moses (Deut 30:19; 31:19; 32:1-43)

It was said that the adaptation of the treaty form for the Israelites' use in order to express the nature of their relationship to God.⁸⁷ The Israelites were in effect vassals to Egypt, but that old bondage was brought to an end in the Exodus from Egypt. After the Israelites were liberated from bondage to an earthly power, they submitted themselves in the Sinai covenant to become vassals of YHWH, who had liberated them from Egypt.⁸⁸ Hence, such overall structure of the book of Deuteronomy suggests that it can be regarded essentially as a unity.⁸⁹

Even though such parallel structure is constructed, numerous details are questionable. For instance, Deut 4:44-49 should not be classified as the "Historical Prologue." It is a heading to the second speech of Moses. In addition, the retelling of the story of the Golden Calf in Deut 9-10 is more than the "General Stipulations" because of its narrative style. Furthermore, the fact that the different parts of the book can be constructed as a treaty does not mean that such different parts were written at the same time. It is also possible that the parts were formed in different periods, but were grouped into the treaty structure later.

The view that a treaty structure can prove the unity of Deuteronomy has also been challenged by others who have expressed skepticism about the parallel to

⁸⁷ Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 23.

⁸⁸ Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 23.

⁸⁹ Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 24.

Deuteronomy. For instance, Andrew Mayes indicates the considerable lack of clarity which exists on the precise nature of the relationship between Deuteronomy and the treaties.⁹⁰ It should be emphasised that Deuteronomy is not a treaty document, nor is it presented as a treaty.⁹¹ Rather, Deuteronomy is presented as speeches of Moses before his death; the book of Deuteronomy is in effect his testament.⁹² The last three chapters of the book cannot be included in a treaty form, and Deuteronomy cannot be taken as a “literary imitation” of the treaties.⁹³ Therefore, the arguments for the unity of Deuteronomy which are based on its supposed treaty form are inadmissible.⁹⁴

It has been noticed that the Deuteronomist not only enriched the covenant theme by introducing all the elements of the vassal treaty, but also blurred the covenantal pattern by putting it into a homiletic setting.⁹⁵ Moshe Weinfeld rightly points out that Deuteronomy is not a legal document but an oration.⁹⁶ This distinguishes Deuteronomy from the treaty. The structure of the speeches of Moses follow the legal pattern, but their style is that of a sermon.⁹⁷ It is undeniable that there are relationships between Deuteronomy and the ancient Near Eastern treaties,⁹⁸ but such

⁹⁰ Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 33.

⁹¹ Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 33-34.

⁹² Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 34.

⁹³ Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 34.

⁹⁴ Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 34.

⁹⁵ Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972. Repr., Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1992), 157.

⁹⁶ Weinfeld, *Deuteronomistic School*, 157.

⁹⁷ Weinfeld, *Deuteronomistic School*, 157.

⁹⁸ For a recent discussion, see William S. Morrow, “Fortschreibung in Mesopotamian treaties and in the book of Deuteronomy,” In *Recht und Ethik im Alten Testament: Beiträge des Symposiums ‘Das Alte Testament und die Kultur der Moderne’ anlässlich des 100. Geburtstags Gerhard von Rad (1901-1971), Heidelberg, 18.-21. Oktober 2001* (ed. Bernard M Levinson et al.; Münster: LIT Verlag, 2004), 111-123.

relationships do not form an argument for the unity of Deuteronomy.

In sum, all the reasons that perceive Deut 1-3 as later than Deut 5-26 are not conclusive. There are more reasons to believe that they are composed by the same school. The above discussion of textual witness, stylistic evidence, and factual evidence should be enough to state that Deut 1-3 is written by the same school as the main part of Deuteronomy. In the previous sections it has been argued that Deut 32:48-52 is a later addition to the main body of Deuteronomy; while Deut 1-3 is not. Therefore, it can be deduced that Deut 32:48-52 is later than Deut 1-3.

Deut 4 and the Deuteronomistic History

Deut 4 is a composite text

When we talk about Deut 4,⁹⁹ can we assume that it is a unity? The chapter follows a clear line of flow to give an impression that a unity can be found.¹⁰⁰ It gives the teachings that the Israelites should keep after they entered the land: YHWH is the only God and there is no other beside him.¹⁰¹ The statutes and commandments

⁹⁹ For the sake of convenience, the term “Deut 4” refers to “Deut 4:1-40” in this section.

¹⁰⁰ This view is supported by Norbert Lohfink, Geroge Braulik, Andrew Mayes, Duane Christensen and Moshe Weinfeld. See. Norbert Lohfink, “Verkündigung des Hauptgebots in der jüngsten Schicht des Deuteronomium (Dt 4,1-40),” *Bible und Leben* 5 (1964): 247-256; repr. in an expanded version in *Höre Israel! Auslegung von Texten aus dem Buch Deuteronomium* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1965), 87-120; repr. in *Studien zum Deuteronomium und zur deuteronomistischen Literatur I* (SBA 8; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk GmbH, 1990), 167-191; George Braulik, *Die Mittel deuteronomischer Rhetorik: Erhoben aus Deuteronomium 4, 1-40* (AnBib 68; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978); Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 148; Christensen, *Deuteronomy 1-11*, 71-73; Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1-11*, 221-222.

¹⁰¹ For the structure of Deut 4, see Christopher Begg, “The Literary Criticism of Deut 4, 1-40,” *ETL* (1980): 10-55; Jon D. Levenson, “Who inserted the book of the Torah?” *HTR* 68 (1975): 203-233; A. D. H. Mayes, “Deuteronomy 4 and the Literary Criticism of Deuteronomy,” *JBL* 100 (1981): 23-51;

of their God would give life (Deut 4:3-4) and wisdom (Deut 4:5-8). Moses commands the Israelites not to make idols. He explains that their God is without form, therefore they saw no form from the fire even during the revelation of YHWH (Deut 4:9-20). It emphasises that YHWH is “without form with the various physical images.”¹⁰² The third mention of the exclusion of Moses (Deut 4:21-22) contrasts with the fact that the Israelites would cross the Jordan and take possession of the Promised Land. However, Moses predicts that after the Israelites have settled down, the future generations will provoke YHWH in anger (Deut 4:25), they will quickly perish and will be scattered. Finally they will return to the merciful YHWH (Deut 4:29-31), who is the one and only God as illustrated in the history of His chosen people (Deut 4:32-40).

However, there are clear signs that Deut 4 is a composite text.¹⁰³ We can find three internal evidences. First, the change of singular and plural form of address (*Numeruswechsel*) occurs in at least two levels. On the one hand, we can find the change of number appears at the transition of one paragraph to the other paragraph. For instance, 4:1-28 are mainly plural, while 4:29-40 are mainly singular. On the

Olson, *Deuteronomy and the Death of Moses: A Theological Reading* (OBT; Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1994), 31; Eep Talstra and C. H. J. van der Merwe, “Analysis, Retrieval and the Demand for more data,” in *Bible and Computer* (ed. Johann Cook; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 41-69.

¹⁰² Joo, *Provocation and Punishment: The Anger of God in the Book of Jeremiah and Deuteronomistic Theology* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006), 70.

¹⁰³ Proponents of this view include Henri Cazelles, Siegfried Mittmann, Dietrich Knapp and Christopher Begg. See Henri Cazelles, “Passages in the Singular within Discourse in the Plural of DT 1-4,” *CBQ* 29 (1967): 207-219; Siegfried Mittmann, *Deuteronomium 1,1-6,3: Literarkritisch und Traditionsgeschichtlich Untersucht*. (BZAW 139; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1975); Dietrich Knapp, *Deuteronomium 4: Literarische Analyse und theologische Interpretation* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987); Christopher T. Begg, “The Literary Criticism of Deuteronomy 4,1-40: Contributions to a Continuing Discussion,” *ETL* 56 (1980): 10-55. The composition models can be sub-divided into composite of “layers” and composite of “blocks.”

other hand, there is change of number within a sentence. For our present study, we just examine two examples. In Deut 4:21, Moses said,

“YHWH was angry with me because of your words (דְּבָרֶיכֶם, plural) and he swore that ...I should not enter the good land that YHWH your God (אֱלֹהֶיךָ, singular) is giving you (לְךָ, singular) for an inheritance.”

A mere stylistic change cannot account for this inconsistency. Moreover, in Deut 4:25 Moses said,

“When you beget (תוליד, singular) children and children’s children, and have lived (ונושנתם, plural) in the land a long time, if you become corrupt (והשחתם, plural) by making (ועשיתם, plural) a carved image in the form of anything, and by doing (ועשיתם, plural) what is evil in the eyes of YHWH your God (אֱלֹהֶיךָ, singular), so as to provoke Him to anger...”

The first singular verb “beget” does not combine well with the other four plural verbs (“live,” “corrupt,” “make/ do” and “make/ do”). Also, the singular pronominal suffix in the expression אֱלֹהֶיךָ (“your God”) does not match the plural verbs well.

Second, there are internal contradictions. For example, it is not easy to understand why YHWH speaks from the middle of a fire (4:12) and at the same time also from the height of heaven (4:36).¹⁰⁴ In addition, it is suspected how a single author could write a chapter in which the same nations who are to be dispossessed by the Israelites (4:38) admire peacefully the wisdom of the Israelites (4:6).¹⁰⁵

Third, changes of theme can be detected in Deut 4. The theme “keeping the decrees and laws” (4:1-2, 5-8, 13-14, 40) competes with the other theme “not making

¹⁰⁴ Cazelles, “Passages,” 214.

¹⁰⁵ Cazelles, “Passages,” 214.

an image” (4:9-12, 15-19, 23-28) though out this chapter. One further issue is in one case, “the word of YHWH from fire” is a prohibition of making an image (4:15-16); in the other case, such “word from fire” is used to let the Israelites know that YHWH alone is God (4:35). According to these previous observations, it is hard to maintain the unity of Deut 4 and over-look the internal evidence for the composite character of Deut 4.

Deut 4 is later than Deut 1-3

Since the introduction of the second speech of Moses occurs in Deut 4:44-49, it is clear that Deut 4:1-40 belongs to the last main section of the first speech of Moses in Deut 1-4. Can we, then, take Deut 1-4 as a unity? There are four arguments against the continuity between Deut 1-3 and Deut 4. (i) Deut 1-3 are historical narrative and Deut 4 is parenesis.¹⁰⁶ (ii) Deut 4 exhibits a covenant form, but Deut 1-3 do not.¹⁰⁷ (iii) There is no substantial connection between the events in Deut 1-3 and the exhortations in Deut 4.¹⁰⁸ (iv) Deut 1-3 are anticipating future development in the Deuteronomistic History. These accounts contrast with the freighted theological rhetoric of Deut 4.¹⁰⁹

If Deut 4 can be separated from Deut 1-3, which one is later? There are three

¹⁰⁶ Nathan MacDonald, “The Literary Criticism and Rhetorical Logic of Deuteronomy I-IV,” *VT* 56 (2006): 207.

¹⁰⁷ MacDonald, “Literary Criticism,” 207.

¹⁰⁸ Blenkinsopp, “Deuteronomy,” 97; Moran, “Deuteronomy,” 263; MacDonald, “Literary Criticism,” 207-8.

¹⁰⁹ MacDonald, “Literary Criticism,” 208.

observations that can lead us to believe that Deut 4 is later. In the first place, Deut 3:29 connects smoothly to Deut 31:1,¹¹⁰ and this fact implies that Deut 4 is a later insertion.

Secondly, Deut 4 shares similar themes with Second Isaiah (Isa 40-55),¹¹¹ which is probably an exilic or post-exilic product. Both have typical anti-idolatry polemic sayings (Deut 4:28; Isa 40:19-20; 42:17; 44:9-20; 45:20), both link the unique vocation of Israel with the uniqueness of YHWH by using exodus language (Deut 4:34, 37; Isa 43:16-17; 48:20-21; 51:10), they have confessions of faith declaring that there is only one God (Deut 4:35, 39; Isa 43:11; 44:6; 45:5, 6, 18, 21, 22; 46:9), and both use the verb בָּרָא (“to create,” Deut 4:32 ; Isa 45:12, 18).¹¹²

Finally, Deut 4:27 speaks about the “scattering” of the Israelites among the peoples and the nations. The explicit reference to the “scattering” of the Israelites suggests that this unit is very late. Some have suggested that this is a sign for the time of Babylonia exile.¹¹³ However, the usage of the verb פָּרֵץ (“to scatter”) is different from the usual understanding of the exile. Usually, the verb גָּלָה (“to take into exile”/ “to deport”) will be used for the action of carrying the people into exile. Furthermore, the “peoples” and “nations” in Deut 4:27 are *plural* rather than singular. Such descriptions match the dispersion of the Jews throughout the nations, a phenomenon that has its first peak in the Hellenistic period, two or three centuries

¹¹⁰ MacDonald, “Literary Criticism,” 208.

¹¹¹ Blenkinsopp, “Deuteronomy,” 98; Lohfink, “Deuteronomy,” 230; Römer, *So-Called*, 124, n. 30.

¹¹² Blenkinsopp, “Deuteronomy,” 98.

¹¹³ Blenkinsopp, “Deuteronomy,” 98; Levinson, “Deuteronomy,” 352. There is also opinion that Deut 4 is an addition from the Persian Period, see Römer, *So-Called*, 124, n. 30.

after the Babylonian exile.¹¹⁴ Therefore, part of Deut 4 would be very late.

To say that Deut 4* is exilic or even post-exilic does not assert that different parts of Deut 4 were formed in the same period, rather, there are two indications of development of Deut 4 over time. First, the *switching of thematic focus*: from theophany and Decalogue (Deut 4:9-14) to a denunciation of images (Deut 4:15-24), then to a consideration of Israel's future fate (Deut 4:25-31), and finally to uniqueness of YHWH (Deut 4:32-39).¹¹⁵ Second, the *changing definition of "covenant"*: "covenant" means the whole Decalogue (Deut 4:13), the prohibition of images (Deut 4:23), and the promise to the ancestors (Deut 4:31).¹¹⁶ Hence, Deut 4 is later than Deut 1-3, and different layers of it were inserted into the first speech of Moses in different periods.¹¹⁷

Deut 4 and the Deuteronomistic History

Martin Noth is not sure whether Deut 4:1-40 is to be attributed to the Deuteronomist or seen as a later addition.¹¹⁸ Although he claims that Deut 4:1-2, 5-8, 10-14, 22-23a and 25-28 fit the context of the Deuteronomistic History perfectly,¹¹⁹ he does not explain how they fit such context. Others believe that Deut 4 was a

¹¹⁴ Johan Lust, "Exile and Diaspora: Gathering from Dispersion in Ezekiel," in *Lectures et Relectures de la Bible: Festschrift P.-M. Bogaert* (ed. J.-M. Auwers and A. Wénin; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999), 99-122.

¹¹⁵ Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 62.

¹¹⁶ Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 62.

¹¹⁷ Matthias Köckert suggests that Deut 4 is related to the prohibition of cult image which was developed after the exile. Hence, according to Köckert, Deut 4 is post exilic. See Matthias Köckert, "Die Entstehung des Bilderverbots," in *Die Welt der Götterbilder* (ed. Brigitte Groneberg et al; BZAW 376; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2007), 272-290.

¹¹⁸ Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 57.

¹¹⁹ Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 57-59.

secondary Deuteronomist addition,¹²⁰ and was complied by one¹²¹ or several later redactors of the Deuteronomistic History.¹²²

It is true that the style of Deut 4 is more correlated with other blocks or layers of later materials in the Deuteronomistic History.¹²³ There are two stylistic evidences for the connection between the unit Deut 4:21-28¹²⁴ and the Deuteronomistic work. First, in Deut 4:25 we find the clause “you do what is evil in the eyes of YHWH.” Similar clauses which contain the combination of the verb עשה (“to do”), the adjective רע (“evil”) or the noun רעה (“evil”), and the phrase בעיני יהוה (“in the eyes of YHWH”) occur forty-one times in the Deuteronomistic History.¹²⁵ In the Pentateuch, this clause only occurs five times (once in Numbers, four times in Deuteronomy).¹²⁶ Thus, Deut 4:25 contains a clause which is frequently used in the Deuteronomistic work. If the verb כעס (“to provoke [God] to anger”) is also counted, we can find four similar occurrences in the books of Kings:

“you do what is evil in the eyes of YHWH to provoke Him to anger”	Occurrence in Deut 4 and DtrH
ועשיתם הרע בעיני יהוה אלהיך להכעיסו	Deut 4:25
כל הרעה אשר עשה בעיני יהוה להכעיסו	1 Kgs 16:7
לעשות הרע בעיני יהוה להכעיסו	2 Kgs 17:17

¹²⁰ Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 148.

¹²¹ Moran, “Deuteronomy,” 257.

¹²² Richard Nelson, *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History* (JSOTSup 18; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981), 94; Veijola, “Principal Observations,” 255.

¹²³ MacDonald, “Literary Criticism,” 208.

¹²⁴ For our present study, we just look at the unit Deut 4:21-28 rather than Deut 4, whose scale will be too much to be discussed here.

¹²⁵ Judg 2:11; 3:7, 12(2x); 4:1; 6:1; 10:6; 13:1; 1 Sam 15:19; 2 Sam 12:9; 1 Kgs 11:6; 14:22; 15:26; 15:34; 16:19, 25, 30; 21:20, 25; 22:52; 2 Kgs 3:2; 8:18, 27; 13:2, 11; 14:24; 15:9, 18, 24, 28; 17:2, 17; 21:2, 6, 15, 16, 20; 23:32, 37; 24:9, 19.

¹²⁶ Num 32:13; Deut 4:25; 9:18; 17:2; 31:29.

לעשות הרע בעיני יהוה להכעיס	2 Kgs 21:6
עשו את הרע בעיני ויהיו מכעסים אתי	2 Kgs 21:15

The first occurrence is in 1 Kgs 16:7, the context of which is that Baasha did all the evil in the eyes of YHWH to provoke Him to anger with the work of his hands. The phrase “the works of his hands,” as we shall see later, implies the idol he had made. The second occurrence can be found in 2 Kgs 17:17. The background of 2 Kgs 17 is a detailed explanation of the fall of Samaria which the king of Assyria had captured (2 Kgs 17:6). The Deuteronomists explain that the Israelites had sinned against YHWH by listing out a series of transgressions which the Israelites had committed.¹²⁷ Such actions were evil in the eyes of YHWH, and provoked Him to anger. In 2 Kgs 21:6 we find the third occurrence of the clause. 2 Kgs 21:2-6 are about the works of Manasseh who did a series of sins which were evil in the eyes of YHWH. The last occurrence of the clause can be found in 2 Kgs 21:15 in which there are a few variations. This is a saying of YHWH, so we find “evil in *my* eyes” rather than “evil in the eyes of YHWH.” Also, it is “provoking *Me* to anger” rather than “provoke Him to anger.” What is the subject of the clause? Who did the evil? It can be found in the previous verse (2 Kgs 21:14), that is נחלתי (“my inheritance”). According to the usage of the noun נחלה in 1 Kgs 8:51 and 53, the Israelites are YHWH’s inheritance which He brought out of Egypt. In 2 Kgs 21:15, here, the

¹²⁷ Recently, Knoppers observes that there are two different views of post-exilic Samaritan in 2 Kgs 17. Thus 2 Kgs 17 is probably a redacted unit. Current scholarship understands the Samaritan to be Northern Israelites rather than foreigners as one of the layers of 2 Kgs 17 claims. See Gray N. Knoppers, “Cutheans or Children of Jacob? The Issue of Samaritan Origins in 2 Kings 17,” in *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld* (ed. R. Rezetko, T. H. Lim, and W. B. Aucker; VTSup 113; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 223-39.

Deuteronomists emphasises on the continuity of their sin, the Israelites have continued to do the evil in the eyes of YHWH from the day of exodus to his present day.

We can see the usage of these four occurrences of the clause. The first (1 Kgs 16:7) and third (2 Kgs 21:6) are used on the king of the Northern Kingdom and Southern Kingdom respectively. The second (2 Kgs 17:17) is applied on the people of the Israelites after the fall of the Northern Kingdom. The last one (2 Kgs 21:15) depicts all the Israelites from the day of exodus to that present day. Thus, Moses' prediction in Deut 4:25 is fulfilled in the final part of the Deuteronomistic History.¹²⁸

The second stylistic similarity is the distinctive modifier **מעשה ידי אדם עץ ואבן** ("made of hands of man, wood and stone") which occurs only twice in the Hebrew Bible.

Made of hands of man, wood and stone	Occurrence in Deut 4 and DtrH
מעשה ידי אדם עץ ואבן	Deut 4:28
מעשה ידי אדם עץ ואבן	2 Kgs 19:18

In Deut 4:28 this phrase is used to modify the **אלהים** ("gods") which the Israelites would serve. In 2 Kgs 19:18 this phrase is used as a modifier of **אלהיהם** ("their gods") which the kings of Assyria had destroyed by fire. Thus we observe that the

¹²⁸ There are studies which re-consider the connection between Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History. Graeme Auld proposes that the "Book of Two Houses," a narrative focused on the house of David and the house of YHWH in Jerusalem, was the common source shared by both Samuel-Kings and Chronicles. See A. Graeme Auld, "Prophets Shared-but Recycled," in *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History* (ed. Thomas Römer; BETL 47; Leuven: Peters, 2000), 19-28; repr. in idem, *Samuel at the Threshold: Selected Works of Graeme Auld* (SOTSMS; Burlington, Vt.: Ashgate, 2004), 127-34; Gray Knoppers has pointed out the significant differences between Deuteronomy and the book of Kings. See Gray N. Knoppers, "Rethinking the Relationship between Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History: The Case of Kings," *CBQ* 63 (2001): 393-415.

unique phrase has the same function in Deut 4 and the Deuteronomistic History.

Since the usage of the verb פָּרֵץ (“to scatter”) in Deut 4 shows that Deut 4 can be very late, and Deut 4 itself contains different layers, so we may conclude that Deut 4 is a mixture of young layers in the Deuteronomistic work.

The relative order of Deut 31 and Deut 1-3

Deut 31 can be read as a continuation of Deut 3¹²⁹ because the language used is repeated largely from Deut 1-3.¹³⁰ So it was assigned as Deuteronomistic.¹³¹ One may think that it was formed by the same hand of Deut 1-3*.¹³² However, there is extensive evidence for a complex history of development of Deut 31. Firstly, Deut 31:16-22 interrupts the connection of 31:14-15 to verse 23. Deut 31:14-15 break into the narrative abruptly.¹³³ Secondly, the act of Moses in writing the law (Deut 31:9-13 and 24) is interrupted by the sections about Joshua (31:13-14, 23) and the song (31:16-22).¹³⁴ Thirdly, in the “song” tradition, Israel’s future apostasy is already a foregone conclusion (Deut 31:16-22, 28-29). However, in the covenant making tradition, there is yet hope that Israel might avoid catastrophe (Deut 31:9-13).¹³⁵ Thus, there is a tension between the traditions. Fourthly, there are at least six doublets: (a) announcement of the imminent mortality of Moses (Deut 31:1

¹²⁹ Blenkinsopp, “Deuteronomy,” 107; Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 372; Miller, *Deuteronomy*, 217; Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 29, 59; von Rad, *Deuteronomy*, 188.

¹³⁰ Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 333.

¹³¹ Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 372; Smith, *Deuteronomy*, 332; G. E. Wright, “Deuteronomy,” 511.

¹³² Smith, *Deuteronomy*, 332.

¹³³ Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 355.

¹³⁴ Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 355.

¹³⁵ Levinson, “Deuteronomy,” 416.

and 14-15);¹³⁶ (b) appointment of Joshua (Deut 31:7-8 and 14-15, 23);¹³⁷ (c) double traditions concerning what Moses writes (the law in Deut 31:24; the song in 31:19);¹³⁸ (d) handing over the law (Deut 31:9 and 25-26);¹³⁹ (e) teaching of the song (Deut 31:22 and 30);¹⁴⁰ and (f) the identity of the future witness (the song in Deut 31:19, but the law in 31:26).¹⁴¹

Hence, Deut 31 is quite complex and contains many layers of tradition or redaction.¹⁴² Nelson proposes that Deut 31 is the result of successive processes of supplementation. Deut 31:1-13 are the Deuteronomistic layer; 31:14-15 and 23 belong to the JE level (or a non-Priestly level); 31:16-22 belong to the “Song as witness” stratum and 31:24-29 are the layer of “Law as witness.”¹⁴³ Nelson’s proposal is persuasive, and we will concur with him that Deut 31:1-6 is *mainly* Deuteronomistic.

Deut 34 and the Pentateuch Redaction

We shall begin with the observation that Deut 34:4 and 5 are in the same cohesive section. Otto suggests that the structure of Deut 34 is related to the form of the main verbs in the passage, and can be presented as the following.¹⁴⁴

¹³⁶ Levinson, “Deuteronomy,” 416.

¹³⁷ Levinson, “Deuteronomy,” 416; Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 355.

¹³⁸ Levinson, “Deuteronomy,” 416.

¹³⁹ Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 355.

¹⁴⁰ Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 355.

¹⁴¹ Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 355.

¹⁴² Levinson, “Deuteronomy,” 416.

¹⁴³ Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 356.

¹⁴⁴ Eckart Otto, *Deuteronomium 23,16-34,12* (HThKAT; Freiburg: Herder, 2017), 2271.

Deut 34:	
1-6a	waw + Imperfect: narrative
6b	Perfect ולא ידע איש... עד היום הזה
7	Nominal sentence ומשה + comment
8	waw + Imperfect: narrative
9	Nominal sentence ויהושע + comment
10-12	Perfect ולא קם נביא עוד

In Deut 34:1-6a and 8, the two short narratives consist of the main verbs in the form of waw + Imperfect. In both verses 6b and 10-12, the sentences have the main verbs in Perfect, each begins with **ולא**. Lastly, 34:7 and 9 begins with the names Moses and Joshua respectively, followed by comments on them. Our focus will be in Deut 34:4-5, which is in the first section (Deut 34:1-6a).

There are five waw + Imperfect (or wayyiqtol) in the first section of Deut 34, each with a subject:

Deut 34:	waw + Imperfect	Subject
1a	ויעל	משה
1b	ויראהו	יהוה
4	ויאמר	יהוה
5	וימת	משה
6a	ויקבר	(יהוה)

Two of the waw + Imperfect have Moses as their subject (Deut 34:1a, 5); another two consist of YHWH as their specific subject (Deut 34:1b, 4). The fifth waw + Imperfect in Deut 34:6a lacks an explicit subject, so that it can be interpreted as YHWH or as an indeterminate subject.¹⁴⁵ In the phrases in which YHWH is the

¹⁴⁵ López, “Deut 34”, 52.

subject, Moses functions as the direct or indirect object, thus making the section cohesive in the whole.¹⁴⁶

Although Deut 34:4 and 5 are in the same cohesive section, do they belong to the same redaction layer? Now, it is beyond our scope of the present chapter to work out the whole complex history of the composition of the chapter of Deut 34.

Therefore, we shall focus on the relationship between verses 4 and 5 after we have a brief review of the studies on the composition of Deut 34.

Traditional source analysis takes Deut 34 as a composite. It is thought that the old historical source, JE, was first expanded by the Deuteronomist, and then was edited by the Priestly editor. JE is credited with 34:1b-5a, 6 and 10; D contains verses 11-12; and P has 34:1a, (5b), 7-9.¹⁴⁷ But there is no absolute agreement on the specific verses to be attributed to the different sources.¹⁴⁸

Perlitt questions the work of a Priestly redactor in Deut 34. He argues that Deut 34:1a, 7-9 do not belong to the Priestly source, rather they are the blend of D and P at the end of the redactional process.¹⁴⁹ Although attempts have been made to defend the presence of different sources in Deut 34,¹⁵⁰ such attempts have not gone

¹⁴⁶ López, "Deut 34", 52.

¹⁴⁷ G. E. Wright, "Deuteronomy," 535.

¹⁴⁸ For a table of comparison of different views on the sources of Deut 34, see Bertholet, *Deuteronomium*, 112. Lux offers another view on the Priestly composition in Deut 34, see Rüdiger Lux, "Der Tod des Mose als »besprochene und erzählte Welt«, " ZThK 84 (1987), 401-409.

¹⁴⁹ Perlitt, "Priesterschrift," 76-88.

¹⁵⁰ Joel S. Baden analyses the three sources (J, E and P) in Deut 34. See Joel S. Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch: Renewing the Documentary Hypothesis* (Hew Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2012), 147-48. For other examples, see Hans-Christoph Schmitt, "Spätdeuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk und Priesterschrift in Deuteronomium 34," in *Textarbeit: Studien zu Texten und ihrer Rezeption aus dem Alten Testament und der Umwelt Israels: Festschrift für Peter Weimar zur Vollendung seines 60* (ed. K. Kiesow and T. Meurer; Münster: Ugarit, 2003), 407-424; Lohr Schmidt, "Im Dickicht der Pentateuchforschung: Ein Plädoyer für die umstrittene

unchallenged.¹⁵¹

Another tendency of reading Deut 34 is to consider that this end chapter of Deuteronomy has been edited by different processes of redaction. Félix Gracia López mentions that Deut 34 can be read at three successive levels.¹⁵² The first level is a DtrH level which contains Deut 34:1*, 2aα, 5(*) and 6a. The second level is a KD (Die vor-priesterliche Komposition)¹⁵³ which contains 34:2aβ-4, 10-12.¹⁵⁴ The third level is a KP (Die priesterliche Komposition) which has 34:1*, 5b*, 7a and 8-9.¹⁵⁵ Since our main focus is the relationship between verse 4 and 5, we will not repeat López's detailed analysis here. How can he distinguish verse 4 from verse 5? It begins with the observation that Deut 34:1a, 5* is in parallel with Num 33:38a.¹⁵⁶

וימת שם	...	אל הר ההר	ויעל אהרן הכהן	Num 33:38a
וימת שם	אל הר נבו	ויעל משה מערבת מואב	Deut 34:1a, 5*

In both cases, the sequence ויעל, אל and וימת שם coincide.¹⁵⁷ Then López suggests that the narrator of Deut 34 might well have limited himself to saying “Moses went

Neuere Urkundenhypothese,” *VT* 60 (2010): 400-20; Philip Y. Yoo, “The Four Moses Death Accounts,” *JBL* 131 (2012): 423-441.

¹⁵¹ See Serge Frolov, “The Death of Moses and the Fate of Source Criticism,” *JBL* 133 (2014): 648-660; Philip Y. Yoo, “The Place of Deuteronomy 34 and Source Criticism; A Response to Serge Frolov,” *JBL* 133 (2014): 661-668.

¹⁵² López, “Deut 34”, 61.

¹⁵³ Here, López is using the terms of Erhard Blum. See Erhard Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch* (BZAW 189; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990).

¹⁵⁴ López argues that Deut 34:4 belongs to the same literary composition as Exod 33:1; Deut 31:14-15, 23. See López, “Deut 34”, 58.

¹⁵⁵ López, “Deut 34”, 56-61.

¹⁵⁶ Félix García López, “Deut 34, Dtr History and the Pentateuch,” in *Studies in Deuteronomy: In Honour of C. J. Labuschagne on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* (ed. F. García Martínez et al.; VTSup 53; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 54.

¹⁵⁷ López, “Deut 34”, 54.

up to X and died there.”¹⁵⁸ This short statement makes clear the possible independence of 34:1a, 5* from 34:1b-4. Thus, verses 1b-4 can be viewed as an insertion to 34:1a, 5*. Therefore, verses 4 and 5 belong to different layers. But which one is earlier? According to López’s suggestion of the three successive levels, 34:5* is earlier than 34:4.¹⁵⁹

It is doubtful if there is sufficient evidence for assigning Deut 34:4 to KD.

Römer and Brettler propose another way to look at 34:4 and also the formation of the whole chapter of Deut 34.¹⁶⁰ They argue that Deut 34:4 is not Deuteronomistic on the grounds of the following observations. In the first place, the form of the Promised Land in Deut 34:4 does not agree with its typical Deuteronomistic form.¹⁶¹ Furthermore, Deut 34:4 names the three patriarchs rather than using the term אבות (“fathers”), which is more typical in Deuteronomy.¹⁶² Finally, Deut 34:4 uses the phrase זאת הארץ (“this [is] the land”), but nowhere else does Deuteronomy use such expression.¹⁶³ Consequently, Römer and Brettler believe that Deut 34:4 belongs to a redactional layer which aims to strengthen the coherence of the Pentateuch.¹⁶⁴ It belongs to (or close to) the end of the redaction of the Pentateuch.¹⁶⁵

¹⁵⁸ López, “Deut 34”, 54.

¹⁵⁹ But 34:5b* is later than 34:4. However, López has not defined clear the content of Deut 34:5b*.

¹⁶⁰ Thomas C. Römer and Marc Z. Brettler, “Deuteronomy 34 and the Case for a Persian Hexateuch,” *JBL* 119 (2000): 401-19.

¹⁶¹ Nowhere else in Deuteronomy is the Promised Land presented as a quotation introduced by לאמר. Römer and Brettler, “Deuteronomy 34,” 405.

¹⁶² Römer and Brettler, “Deuteronomy 34,” 405.

¹⁶³ Römer and Brettler, “Deuteronomy 34,” 405.

¹⁶⁴ Römer and Brettler, “Deuteronomy 34,” 405.

¹⁶⁵ Thomas Römer, *Israels Väter: Untersuchungen zur Väterthematik im Deuteronomium und in der deuteronomistischen Tradition* (OBO 99; Fribourg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), 254.

How about Deut 34:5? This verse, according to Römer and Brettler, belongs to the original Deuteronomistic version of Deut 34. This layer contains Deut 34:1*, 4a?, 5-6. The title עֶבֶד יְהוָה (“servant of YHWH”) applied to Moses is a Deuteronomistic feature.¹⁶⁶ This layer encourages Deuteronomy to be read in conjunction with the book of Joshua.¹⁶⁷ The second layer has 34:1*, 7-9. This layer reflects the effort of the creation of a Hexateuch.¹⁶⁸ The third stratum contains 34:1-3*, 4*, 10-12. This layer is a Pentateuch redaction, which is decisively rejecting the potential continuity between Deuteronomy and the book of Joshua.¹⁶⁹ Thus, according to the reconstructions of Römer and Brettler, Deut 34:5 is earlier than 34:4b.

Konrad Schmid, with other reasons, also proposes that Deut 34:4 is later.¹⁷⁰ There are three arguments that support Deut 34:4 as a Pentateuch Redaction.¹⁷¹ First, Deut 34:4 contains the land promise as an oath to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, which is strictly a Pentateuchal theme.¹⁷² Second, the notion of the land promise to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as an oath already seems to presuppose P and D. Thus it belongs to the latest literary development of the Pentateuch.¹⁷³ Third, Deut 34:4 refers back to Gen 12:7 and 13:15, and thus forms an *inclusio*.¹⁷⁴

¹⁶⁶ Römer and Brettler, “Deuteronomy 34,” 404.

¹⁶⁷ Römer and Brettler, “Deuteronomy 34,” 416.

¹⁶⁸ Römer and Brettler, “Deuteronomy 34,” 416.

¹⁶⁹ Römer and Brettler, “Deuteronomy 34,” 417.

¹⁷⁰ Schmid’s thesis is that Deut 34:4, 7 and 10-12 are connected to Pentateuch redaction. Konrad Schmid, “The Late Persian Formation of the Torah: Observations on Deuteronomy 34,” in *Judah and the Judeans in the fourth Century B.C.E.* (ed. Oded Lipschits et al.; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 237-251.

¹⁷¹ For a discussion on the meaning of “Pentateuch Redaction,” see Schmid, “The Late Persian,” 239-241.

¹⁷² Schmid, “The Late Persian,” 242.

¹⁷³ Schmid, “The Late Persian,” 242.

¹⁷⁴ There is a quotation of Gen 12:7 (the promise of the land given) and a clear connection with Gen

The above conclusions of Schmid, Römer and Brettler are cogent, and therefore, we know that Deut 34:4 and 5 are in different layers. However, can we assume that Deut 34:5 itself is a unity? The phrase **עַבַּד יְהוָה** points to the Deuteronomistic level, while the phrase **עַל פִּי יְהוָה** implies that it presupposes the command of YHWH to Moses in the post-Priestly level (Deut 32:48-52). Therefore we shall say that Deut 34:5a is older than Deut 34:4, but 34:5b may be later.

Summary

It has been discussed that Deut 1-3* and Deut 5-26* are composed by the same school; while Deut 32:48-52 is a supplement to the book of Deuteronomy. Therefore, Deut 32:48-52 is later than Deut 1-3*. The style of Deut 1-3* matches that of the main part of the book. Therefore, it cannot be denied that Deut 1-3 can still perform as an introduction of the book of Deuteronomy. Deut 1-3 can be the introduction to the Deuteronomistic History as well as the Deuteronomic law because it provides the background information for both parts. Deut 4 is later than Deut 1-3, and belongs to a mixture of late strata of the Deuteronomistic History. Deut 31:1-6 is related to Deut 1-3, so it is older than Deut 4. Deut 34:4-5* is younger than the above texts. Hence, the order of the Deuteronomic texts are: Deut 1-3*, Deut 31:1-6, Deut 34:5a, Deut 4*, Deut 32:48-52, and the last, Deut 34:4, 5b.

13:10-15 (same phrases are used). Schmid, "The Late Persian," 243.

2. The Diachronic Order of Num 20:1-13, Num 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52

In the previous chapter, we have studied the relative chronological order of the Deuteronomic texts. The purpose of this present chapter is to determine the diachronic order of Num 20:1-13; 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52.

A) The contexts of Num 20:1-13, Num 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52

This study includes Num 20:1-13 and 27:12-14, instead of paying attention only to Deut 32:48-52, because Deut 32:48-52 mentions Moses' exclusion, but does not provide the detailed incident to illustrate how Moses broke faith with YHWH and how he did not regard YHWH as holy. Deut 32:48-52, like Num 27:12-14, alludes to the incident of Num 20:1-13. What are the contexts of these three passages? The narrative of Num 20:1-13 comes after the two chapters of law instructions which depict the responsibility of the priests and Levites (Num 18), and the instruction about the "Red Heifer" (Num 19). Thus, it seems that the narrative in Num 20 does not directly connect to its previous two chapters, but continues the conflict narrative in Num 16-17.¹⁷⁵ According to Num 16, the conflict between Moses and the Korah group is about the authority of Moses. In Num 20:1-13, the conflict between Moses

¹⁷⁵ For a holistic reading of Numbers, see Pekka Pitkänen, *A Commentary on Numbers: Narrative, Ritual, and Colonialism* (Routledge Studies in the Biblical World; London; New York: Routledge, 2017).

and the people is about the lack of water to drink. The exclusion of Moses and Aaron is the punishment for how they handled this conflict. After the incident of the waters of Meribah (Num 20:1-13), is the narrative that Edom refused the proposed passage for the Israelites (Num 20:14-21). Then we have the death of Aaron (Num 20:22-29), in which the sin of Moses and Aaron is mentioned again (Num 20:24).

Num 27:12-14 does not have a clear connection to Num 27:1-11, which is about the issue of the possession of the daughters of Zelophehad. The wider context of Num 27:12-14 is Num 27:12-23, of which the main theme is the appointment of Joshua as the successor of Moses. Since Moses could not enter the land (Num 27:12-14), Joshua became the new leader so that the Israelites might not be like sheep without a shepherd (Num 27:17). As such, Num 27:12-14, which recounts the reason for Moses' exclusion from Num 20:1-13, is subordinate to the theme of succession of Joshua. Hence, the exclusion of Moses is the background for such succession.

Deut 32:48-52 is in the outer historical frame (Deut 1-3, 31-34) of the Book of Deuteronomy. Deut 31-34 can be divided into two parts. In the first part, Deut 31:1-32:47, Moses passed his leadership to Joshua, the priests, the elders and the Levites because he would die.¹⁷⁶ YHWH foretold that the Israelites would rebel against Him, and commanded Moses to write a song to teach the Israelites as a

¹⁷⁶ W. L. Moran observes that the institution of the covenant can provide a deep unity in Deut 31-32, such institution includes a written covenant document, periodic reading of the document, placing of the document in the ark, and witnesses. See Moran, "Deuteronomy," 274.

witness of their rebellion. Moses carried out YHWH's instruction, he wrote the song and spoke it to the people. In the second part, Deut 32:48-34:12, YHWH commands Moses to go up a mountain and to die there. Moses blessed the Israelites before he followed YHWH's command. In Deut 34 Moses ascended a mountain and died there according to the command of YHWH. This final chapter concludes the Book of Deuteronomy and also the Pentateuch as well. Therefore, Deut 32:48-52 does not have strong a connection to the song of Moses in Deut 32:1-47. Instead, it can be an introduction to the blessings of Moses (Deut 33) before his death.

While the *content* of Deut 32:48-52 is very similar to that of Num 27:12-14, its *context* is totally different from that of Num 27:12-14. The table below shows that these two passages are in very different historical and literary contexts.

A Comparison of the context of Num 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52

Num 20-36		Deut 32-34	
Non narrative	Narrative	Narrative	Non narrative
	The sin of Moses and Aaron, the encounter with Edom and the death of Aaron (20)		
	The encounter with the Canaanites, the copper snake, and the battles with Sihon and Og (21)		
	Balaam (22-24)		
	Idolatry and Expiation at Baal-Poer (25)		
The second Census (26)			
	The incident of the daughters of Zelophehad (27:1-11)		
			The Song of

			Moses (32:1-47)
	Moses is told to ascend the mountain (27:12-14)	Moses is told to ascend the mountain (32:48-52)	
	The succession of Moses by Joshua (27:15-23)		
			The blessing of Moses (33)
The Calendar of public sacrifices (28-29)			
The law of vows and oaths (30)			
	The battle with Midian (31)		
	The settlement of Transjordan (32)		
The wilderness itinerary (33)			
The boundaries of the Promised land (34)			
The Levitical towns and the cities of refuge (35)			
	The second incident of the daughters of Zelophehad (36)		
		The death of Moses (34)	

There are three main contextual differences between Num 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52 which are related to our study. The first one is about the succession of Joshua. We have mentioned that the command to Moses to go up the mountain of the Abarim in Num 27:12-14 is placed in the introduction of the theme of new leadership. The succession of Joshua (Num 27:15-23) occurred *after* the command of God to Moses. In Deut 31:7-8, Joshua was already encouraged by Moses, and in Deut 32:23, by YHWH. The succession of Joshua occurred *before* God's command to Moses to

ascend the mountain of Abarim in Deut 32:48-52.

The second is about the death of Moses. In Numbers, Moses had not been told about his death before YHWH's command to him to ascend the mountain in Num 27:12-14. However, in Deuteronomy, Moses already knew that he would die before the command of ascending the mountain in Deut 32:48-52. In Deut 4:22, Moses said that he was going to die in the land without crossing over the Jordan. In Deut 31:14, YHWH told Moses that his time to die was near. Moses mentioned his death twice in Deut 31:27, 29. In Num 27:12-14, there is no explicit statement about the exclusion of Moses. The exclusion is implied by the death of Moses. In Deut 32:48-52 we can find an explicit statement about the exclusion of Moses.

Finally, according to the book of Deuteronomy, it is possible that the three events, "the delivering of the three speeches of Moses," "the singing of his song," and "the receiving of the command to ascend the mountain," occur on the same day (Deut 1:3; 31:22; 32:48). It also seems that Moses ascended Mount Nebo (Deut 34) without any delay after giving his blessings in Deut 33. However in the context of Numbers, there is the battle with Midian in Num 31. We do not know how long this battle lasted. But it is stated that after the battle, there were *seven days* for the soldiers to purify themselves by camping outside the camp (Num 31:19-20). Therefore, according to the book of Numbers Moses did not ascend the mountain immediately after he was told to do so.

Having comparing the contexts of the three passages, we now look at one of

their differences on wordings of the exclusion of Moses. The three texts can be read in parallel:

Num 20:12	Num 27:14	Deut 32:51-52
...יען לא האמנתם בי	14 כאשר מריתם פי	51 על אשר מעלתם בי
		בתוך בני ישראל
		במי מריבת קדש
	במדבר זן	מדבר זן
	במריבת העדה	
		על אשר
להקדישני	להקדישני	לא קדשתם אותי
	במים	
לעיני בני ישראל	לעיניהם	בתוך בני ישראל
	הם מי מריבת קדש	
	מדבר זן	
		52 כי מנגד תראה
		את הארץ
לכן לא תביאו		ושמה לא תבוא
את הקהל הזה		
אל הארץ		אל הארץ
אשר נתתי		אשר אני נתן
להם		לבני ישראל

Num 20:12	Num 27:14	Deut 32:48-52
...“Because you have not believed in me,	14 for you rebelled (against) my word.	51 because you broke faith with me
		in the midst of the Israelites
		at the waters of Meribath Kadesh,
	in the wilderness of Zin,	(in) the wilderness of Zin,
	during the strife of the congregation,	
		because
to regard me as holy	to regard me as holy	you did not regard me as holy
	at the waters	
before the eyes of the Israelites,	before their eyes.”	in the midst of the Israelites.
	These are the waters	

	of Meribath Kadesh	
	(in) the wilderness of Zin.	
		52 For you may see the land at a distance,
therefore you will not bring		and there you will not enter
this assembly		
into the land		into the land
which I have given		which I am giving
to them.”		to the Israelites.”

In Num 20:12, we read the Hiphil stem of **בִּיא** (“lead”) rather than **בִּיא** in the Qal stem (“enter”) which can be found in Deut 32:52. This verb is absent in Num 27:12-14. The usage of the verb in Num 20:12 emphasises on the leadership of Moses and Aaron, while that in Deut 32:52 is about their ban from the land. Thus, in Num 20:12, the punishment of Moses and Aaron is more of the removing of their leadership than of their exclusion. Moreover, the exclusion is not explicitly mentioned in Num 27:12-14, which says that Moses would be gathered to his people. The ban from the Promised Land is implied in the foretelling of Moses’ being gathered to his people. Such foretelling that Moses would be gathered to his people is changed to two commands in Deut 32:48-52. We will examine these differences in the following sections.

B) The uniting of traditions in Num 27:12-14

Num 20:12	Num 20:24	Num 27:14
יען לא האמנתם בי	על אשר מריתם את פי	14 כאשר מריתם פי
		במדבר צן
		במריבת העדה

להקדישני		להקדישני
במים		
לעיניהם		לעיני בני ישראל
הם מי מריבת קדש מדבר צן	למי מריבה	

Num 20:12	Num 20:24	Num 27:14
...because you have not believed in me,	...because you rebelled (against) my word ¹⁷⁷	14 for you rebelled (against) my word
		in the wilderness of Zin,
		during the strife of the congregation,
to regard me as holy		to regard me as holy
		at the waters
before the eyes of the Israelites,		before their eyes.”
	at the waters of Meribah. ¹⁷⁸	These are the waters of Meribath Kadesh (in) the wilderness of Zin.

Since Num 20:24 also states the sin of Moses and Aaron, it will be relevant to examine this passage as well. Num 27:14 has the expressions of both Num 20:12 and 20:24. In Num 20:12 the sin of Aaron and Moses is **לא האמנתם בי** (“you have not believed in me”), while in Num 27:14 is **מריתם פי** (“you rebelled [against] my word”), such phrase, **מריתם פי**, also occurs in Num 20:24 in which a direct object marker can be found. Thus Num 27:14 has one element which is absent in Num 20:12, but common in Num 20:24. However, Num 27:14 contains an infinitive in the expression **להקדישני** (“to sanctify me”), which can be found in Num 20:12, but not

¹⁷⁷ MT has **מריתם את פי** (“you rebelled against my mouth”). The expression **פי** (“my mouth”) is metonymic for “my word,” that is what comes out of my mouth. LXX has *παρωξύνατέ με* (“you provoked me”). It is an interpretation of **מריתם את פי**. See Wevers, *Greek text of Numbers*, 334.

¹⁷⁸ LXX has *τοῦ ὕδατος τῆς λοιδορίας* (“the water of railing”), and it indicates that the translator did not understand **מי מריבה** (“waters of Meribah”) as a place. See Wevers, *Greek text of Numbers*, 334.

in Num 20:24. Besides, the **לעיניהם** (“before their eyes”) in Num 27:14 is very similar to the **לעיני בני ישראל** (“before the eyes of the Israelites”), but such expression is absent in Num 20:24. Hence, Num 27:14 also consists of two elements which are present in Num 20:12, but absent in Num 20:24. Therefore, Num 27:14 may be an amalgamation of Num 20:12 and Num 20:24.

In Num 20:24, where the verb “to sanctify” is absent, the phrases “before the eyes of the Israelites” or “before their eyes” are also absent. One may ask whether the absence of the phrases “before the eyes of the Israelites”/ “before their eyes” in Num 20:24 is due to the absence of “to sanctify” or the change of the verb from “to believe” to “to rebel.” To answer this question, there are three points to note. Firstly, the verb “to believe” is never used in connection with “before the eyes of the Israelites” or “before their eyes” in the Hebrew Bible. Secondly, nowhere can we find any connection between “to rebel” and “before the eyes of the Israelites”/ “before their eyes” in the Hebrew Bible. Thirdly, there are a number of occurrences where “be sanctified” (Niphal) is connected to the phrase “before the eyes of...” (Lev 22:32; Ezek 20:41; 28:25; 36:23; 38:16; 39:27). Therefore, the absence of these two phrases (“before the eyes of the Israelites”/ “before their eyes”) in Num 20:24 is due to the absence of the verb “to sanctify.”

In Num 27:14, the phrase **לעיניהם** (“before their eyes”) is connected to “regard as holy.” Other terms such as **לעיני** (“before my eyes”),¹⁷⁹ **לעינינו** (“before our

¹⁷⁹ **לעיני** (“before my eyes”) occurs six times in the Hebrew Bible: 2 Sam 13:5, 6; Ezek 10:2, 19; Ps

eyes”),¹⁸⁰ לעיניך (“before your[singular] eyes”),¹⁸¹ לעיניכם (“before your[plural] eyes”),¹⁸² and לעיניו (“before his eyes”) ¹⁸³ are not connected to the verb קדש. The phrase לעיניהם occurs three times in Numbers (Num 20:8; 27:14, 19), twenty-two times in the Hebrew Bible, but not even once in Deuteronomy.

The mixing of Num 20:12 with Num 20:24 in Num 27:14 may be an indicator showing that Num 27:14 is later than Num 20:12 (and also Num 20:24). The sin לא האמנתם בי (“you have not believed in me,” Num 20:12) is changed to מריתם [את] פי (“you rebelled against my word,” Num 27:14 and 20:24) is probably due to the usage of the context of Num 20:24. According to Num 27:12-14, the mention of Aaron’s being gathered to his people is used to compare with Moses’ being gathered to his people. Since Num 20:24 depicts that Aaron was going to be gathered to his people, this passage is used in Num 27:12-14. When Num 27:12-14 adopts Aaron’s death, it also adopts the reason for his death: rebelling against YHWH’s word.

C) The rewriting of Num 27:12-14 in Deut 32:48-52

We can find both similarities and differences between Num 27:12-14 and Deut

132:4; Job 31:1.

¹⁸⁰ לעינינו (“before our eyes”) occurs three times in the Hebrew Bible: Deut 6:22; Josh 24:17; Ps 79:10.

¹⁸¹ לעיניך (“before your[singular] eyes”) occurs eight times in the Hebrew Bible: Gen 47:19; Lev 25:53; Deut 4:34; 25:3; 28:31; 2 Sam 12:11; Ps 50:21; Prov 6:4.

¹⁸² לעיניכם (“before your[plural] eyes”) occurs eight times in the Hebrew Bible: Deut 1:30; 9:17; 29:1; 1 Sam 12:16; Jer 16:9; 29:21; 51:24; Zep 3:20.

¹⁸³ לעיניו (“before his eyes”) occurs five times in the Hebrew Bible: Num 19:5; 2 Sam 13:8; 2 Kgs 25:7; Jer 39:6; 52:10.

32:48-52. There are five similarities between them: (i) both passages begin with “and YHWH spoke to Moses...;”¹⁸⁴ (ii) the wordings of the first command **עלה אל הר העברים הזה** (“ascend this mountain of the Abarim”) is the same in Num 27:12 and Deut 32:49; (iii) the expressions of the second command **וראה את הארץ** (“and see the land”) are very similar, but not identical. In Num 27:12 it is just “the land,” but in Deut 32:49 the land is called “land of Canaan;” (iv) both passages use the subordinate clause “as Aaron...was gathered...” to supplement the death of Moses; (v) The place “the waters of Meribath Kadesh in the wilderness of Zin” is stated in both passages, but its syntactical location is different. In Num 27:14 the phrase is at the end of the saying of YHWH, while in Deut 32:51 the phrase is after the sin of Aaron and Moses, and is not at the end of the saying.

There are four main differences between Num 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52. Firstly, there are differences in syntax and in number of imperatives. The exclusion of Moses is not explicitly mentioned in Num 27:12-14, which says that Moses would be gathered to his people. The ban from the Promised land is implied in the foretelling of Moses’ being gathered to his people. Such foretelling that Moses would be gathered to his people is changed to two commands in Deut 32:48-52. Thus, the divine saying to Moses in Deut 32:48-52 consists of four imperatives (ascend, see, die, be gathered). These four commands can be clearly seen from the following literary structure of Deut 32:48-52:

¹⁸⁴ However, the verb used in Num 27:12 is **אמר** (“say”), while the verb in Deut 32:48 is **דבר** (“speak”).

A. YHWH spoke to Moses (v. 48)

B. The contents of the saying (vv. 49-52)

First command: Go up [עלה] the mountain (v. 49a)

Second command: See [ראה] the land (v. 49b)

Third command: Die [מת] at the mountain (v. 50a)

Fourth command: Be gathered [האסף] to your [= Moses] people (v. 50b)

Reasons for carrying out these commands (vv. 51-52)

The structure of Deut 32:48-52 can be divided into two parts: YHWH spoke to Moses and the contents of the saying. The saying mainly consists of four commands: “go up,” “see,” “die” and “be gathered.” These four verbs are imperatives. Then two reasons are given to explain why Moses has to die at the mountain. The syntax of Deut 32:48-52 suggests that the death of Moses is the direct punishment of failing to regard God as holy. The exclusion of Moses from the Promised land is a natural consequence of his death, not a direct penalty of failing to sanctify YHWH. However, in Num 27:12-14 there are only two imperatives (“ascend” and “see”). The command “die” is absent. Moreover, the verb “be gathered” is written in Niphal perfect, but not an imperative. So the sense of this verb is that God told Moses that he would be gathered to his people rather than commanding him to die.

Secondly, there are different sin(s) of Moses. The two versions describe the sin of Moses and Aaron in distinctively different ways. According to Num 27:12-14, Moses and Aaron **מרדו** (“rebelled”) against YHWH’s word and thus (not) to regard

Him as holy. There is only one explanatory conjunction **כִּאֲשֶׁר** (“because”), and **לְהַקְרִישֵׁנִי** is an infinitive in Hiphil stem with the preposition **לְ** and first person pronominal suffix. The Deuteronomic version, however, gives two explanatory conjunctions **עַל אֲשֶׁר** (“because”). The first conjunction introduces their sin as “breaking faith” with YHWH; the second “failing to regard YHWH as holy” in which the verb **קָרַשׁ** is not an infinitive, but Piel perfect. We will discuss this difference later.

Thirdly, there are mainly seven expressions which can be found in Deut 32:48-52, but not in Num 27:12-14: (a) “on the same day” (v.48); (b) “Mount Nebo, which is in the land of Moab, which is across Jericho” (v.49); (c) “for a possession” (v.49); (d) “Die on the mountain that you ascend there” (v.50); (e) “Aaron die on Mount Hor” (v.50); (f) “in the midst of the Israelites” (v.51); (g) the whole verse in Deut 32:52.

Fourthly, there are three expressions which can be found in Num 27:12-14, but not in Deut 32:48-52: (a) “When you have seen it” (v.13); (b) “you too” (v. 13); (c) “during the strife of the congregation” (v. 14). Their differences will be discussed in more detail as follows.

(1) A comparison of Num 27:12 and Deut 32:48-49

Num 27:12	Deut 32:48-49
12 ויאמר יהוה אל משה	48 וידבר יהוה אל משה
	בעצם היום הזה

	לאמר
עלה אל הר העברים הזה	49 עלה אל הר העברים הזה
	הר נבו
	אשר בארץ מואב
	אשר על פני ירחו
וראה את הארץ	וראה את ארץ כנען
אשר נתתי לבני ישראל	אשר אני נתן לבני ישראל
	לאחזה

Num 27:12	Deut 32:48-49
12 And YHWH said to Moses,	48 And YHWH spoke to Moses
	on the same day,
	saying,
“Ascend this mountain of the Abarim,	49 “Ascend this mountain of the Abarim,
	Mount Nebo,
	which is in the land of Moab
	which is across Jericho,
and see the land	and see the land of Canaan,
which I have given to the Israelites.	which I, I am giving to the Israelites
	for a possession.

The text of Deut 32:48-49 is much longer than that of Num 27:12. It is possible that Num 27:12 is an abridged version of Deut 32:48-49. But there is a greater possibility that Deut 32:48-49 is an expansion of Num 27:12. There is information about the *time* of the word of YHWH to Moses in the Deuteronomistic version. The addition of **היום הזה** (“on the same day”) clarifies the time. “The same day” can refer to the “today” in Deut 32:46,¹⁸⁵ and also the day mentioned in Deut 1:3.¹⁸⁶ This reference creates an appearance that Moses delivered his three speeches, sang his song and was told to ascend the mountain *on the same day*. This makes the book of

¹⁸⁵ Finsterbusch, *Deuteronomium*, 192.

¹⁸⁶ Bertholet, *Deuteronomium*, 101; Braulik, *Deuteronomium II*, 236; Dillmann, *Deuteronomium*, 413; Finsterbusch, *Deuteronomium*, 192. Mittmann, *Deuteronomium*, 111.

Deuteronomy the “testament” of Moses.¹⁸⁷

In the Deuteronomic version, we also find modifications on the *locations*. First, there is further description of the mountain where Moses must ascend. The addition of **הר נבו** (“Mount Nebo”), which is further modified by two relative clauses:

אשר על פני ירחו (“which is across Jericho”) and **אשר בארץ מואב** (“which is in the land of Moab”) clarifies the location and connects this passage to Deut 34:1, (“And Moses ascended from the plains of Moab to Mount Nebo...which is across Jericho”).

Second, there is further description of the Promised Land. In Num 27:12, Moses is asked to see “the land”; while in Deut 32:49, the land is called “the land of Canaan.” The exact parallel of “the land of Canaan which I am giving...” (Deut 32:49) occurs at Num 13:2. The **אני** (“I”) for the action of giving the land to the Israelites can be found in Lev 14:34; 23:10; 25:2; Num 13:2; 15:2 but not in Deuteronomy. The change of “I have given” to “I am giving” matches the situation just before the conquest of the land.¹⁸⁸

In Deut 32:49, the land is further modified by the term **לאחזיה** (“for a possession”), which occurs only once in Deuteronomy (Deut 32:49). In Lev 14:34, this term is attached to “the land given by God.” This shows that the term may have an origin outside Deuteronomy and this later redactor used non-Deuteronomic languages in describing “the land.”¹⁸⁹ These additions, one about *time* and the others

¹⁸⁷ Braulik, *Deuteronomium II*, 236.

¹⁸⁸ Mittmann, *Deuteronomium*, 111.

¹⁸⁹ For the characteristic expressions of the Book of Deuteronomy, see John William Colenso, *The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua Critically Examined* (London: Longmans Green and Co, 1878),

about *location*, may be from the redactors of Deuteronomy who connected Deut 32:48-52 to the Book of Deuteronomy. Such elaboration is an indicator that Deut 32:48-52 is later than Num 27:12-14.

(2) A comparison of Num 27:13 and Deut 32:50

Num 27:13	Deut 32:50
	50 ומת בהר
	אשר אתה עלה שמה
13 וראיתך אתה	
ונאספת אל עמך	והאסף אל עמך
גם אתה	
כאשר נאסף אהרן אחיך	כאשר מת אהרן אחיך
	בהר ההר
	והאסף אל עמיו

Num 27:13	Deut 32:50
	50 And die on the mountain
	that you ascend there,
13 "When you have seen it,	
you will be gathered to your people,	and be gathered to your people,
you too	
as Aaron your brother was gathered.	as Aaron your brother died
	on Mount Hor
	and was gathered to his people,

There are two imperatives in the Deut 32:50, but none in the Numbers version. In Num 27:13, the command "die" is absent; the phrase used is "will be gathered to your people." In Deut 32:50, we find two commands: "die" and "be gathered to your people." Such two commands (die and be gathered) are followed by the retelling of

189-191; S. R. Driver, *Introduction*, 99-102.

the death of Aaron, which depicts that Aaron “died,” and “was gathered to his people.” In Num 27:13, the name of the mountain on which Aaron died is also absent. Deut 32:50 gives the name of this mountain, “Mount Hor.” This clarification on the name of the location connects to the traditions of the death of Aaron in the book of Numbers (see Num 20:22-27; 33:37-41). The addition of “and you will die on the mountain” (Deut 32:50) stresses the connection with Deut 34.

(3) A comparison of Num 27:14 and Deut 32:51

Num 27:14	Deut 32:51
14 כאשר מריתם פי	51 על אשר מעלתם בי
	בתוך בני ישראל
	במי מריבת קדש
במדבר צן	מדבר צן
במריבת העדה	
	על אשר
להקדישני	לא קדשתם אותי
במים	
לעיניהם	בתוך בני ישראל
הם מי מריבת קדש מדבר צן	

Num 27:14	Deut 32:51
14 for you rebelled against my word	51 because you broke faith with me
	in the midst of the Israelites
	at the waters of Meribath Kadesh,
in the wilderness of Zin, during the strife of the congregation,	(in) the wilderness of Zin,
	because
to regard me as holy	you did not regard me as holy
at the waters	

before their eyes.”	in the midst of the Israelites.
These are the waters of Meribath Kadesh (in) the wilderness of Zin.	

There is only one explanatory subordinate clause in Num 27:14, which begins with **כֹּאשֶׁר** (“for”); two can be found in Deut 32:51, each begins with the expression **עַל אֲשֶׁר** (“because”). These differences are important because it tells us which one has improved the other.

In Num 27:13, the expression **כֹּאשֶׁר** has been used, but its function is comparative, with meaning of “just as,” not explanatory. However, in Num 27:14, the repeated expression **כֹּאשֶׁר** is explanatory. The fact that an expression occurs twice in one sentence but with different functions and meanings may give rise to misunderstanding. In Deut 32:51 the expression **עַל אֲשֶׁר** is used, and it does not cause any misunderstanding. If we assume that a later version will try to improve its previous version, then this stylistic improvement can be evidence for Deut 32:51 is later than Num 27:14.

It should be noticed that Deut 32:51 does not use only one **עַל אֲשֶׁר**, but two. The meaning of the second explanatory subordinate clause is very clear: Moses and Aaron did not regard YHWH as holy. In Deut 32:51, the verb appears as **לֹא קִדְּשִׁתֶּם אוֹתִי** in the Piel stem and perfect form with a negation. However, according to Num 27:14, the expression **לְהַקְדִּישֵׁנִי** (“to sanctify” or “to regard as holy”) is an infinitive in the Hiphil stem with the preposition **לְ** and with first person pronominal suffix. The construction of Num 27:14 is awkward, **לְהַקְדִּישֵׁנִי בְּמִרְיַת הָעֵדָה** means “when the congregation was rebellious so as to

sanctify me.” The LXX translator may have been aware of the problem, and so he added οὐχ ἡγιάσατέ με (“you did not sanctified me”) after ἡγιάσαι με (“to sanctify me”).¹⁹⁰ Even if one takes the expression לַהֲקַדִּישֵׁנִי as the modifier of פִּי מֵרִיתָם, there is still a problem. David Frankel states that the phrase in it can only be: “you rebelled against my word by sanctifying me,”¹⁹¹ but this understanding is “absurd, for the verse seeks to assert that Moses and Aaron did not sanctify God.”¹⁹² Siegfried Mittmann rightly says that the Deuteronomic redactor rewrote the sentence in a form of parallel causal sentence (with two “because”) in order to avoid any misunderstanding of the sentence.¹⁹³ Thus it is possible that Deut 32:48-52 clarifies Num 27:12-14 by using two explanatory subordinate clauses, and by changing the Hiphil infinitive form of קָדַשׁ to a clause with קָדַשׁ in Piel perfect with explicit negation. The meaning of the sins of Moses is then clarified in these modifications. Hence, it is more reasonable to believe that Deut 32:51 is later than Num 27:14.

Martin Rose believes that the saying of YHWH should end at Num 27:14a.¹⁹⁴ The second half of Num 27:14b “These are the waters of Meribath Kadesh in the wilderness of Zin” is misunderstood, and is put into the saying of YHWH.¹⁹⁵ The phrase should be understood as a gloss which is used to clarify the location that is

¹⁹⁰ Wevers, *Greek text of Numbers*, 464.

¹⁹¹ Frankel, *Murmuring*, 271.

¹⁹² Frankel, *Murmuring*, 271.

¹⁹³ Mittmann, *Deuteronomium*, 111.

¹⁹⁴ Martin Rose, “Empoigner le Pentateuque par sa fin! L’investiture de Josué et la mort de Moïse,” in *Le Pentateuque en question* (ed. A. de Pury and T. Römer; 3d ed.; Genève: Labor et Fides, 2002), 135.

¹⁹⁵ Rose, “Empoigner,” 135.

mentioned in the speech of YHWH.¹⁹⁶ Rose claims that this gloss' formulation corresponds exactly to that of Deut 32:51. He observes that "the waters of Meribath Kadesh in the wilderness of Zin" is an integral element in Deut 32:51, but it is only a gloss in Num 27.¹⁹⁷ Then he concludes that Deut 32:51 is more original.¹⁹⁸

Rose's observations are good, but his conclusion is not convincing. Firstly, the formulation of the phrase is not the same as that of Deut 32:51. In Num 27:14, we have **הם מי מריבת קדש מדבר צן** ("These [are] the waters of Meribath Kadesh in the wilderness of Zin"), while in Deut 32:51, we find **במי מריבת קדש מדבר צן** ("at the waters of Meribath Kadesh, in the wilderness of Zin"). There is a preposition **ב** before the **מי** in Deut 32:51, but the term **הם** can be found in Num 27:14. Secondly, if Num 27:14 is later than Deut 32:51, there is no reason for the author of Num 27 to rewrite the two clear subordinate clauses of Deut 32:51 into one subordinate clause in Num 27:14 which is more difficult to comprehend. Rather, I will argue that Deut 32:51 is a later text. In Num 27:14, there are two occurrences of "in the wilderness of Zin." The first "in the wilderness of Zin during the strife of the congregation" not only repeats with the second "these are the waters of Meribath Kadesh in the wilderness of Zin," but also makes the meaning of the whole clause hard to understand. It seems that the redactor of Deut 32:51 combines the two remarks into one, and adds one more subordinate clause to clarify the meaning of the sin of Moses

¹⁹⁶ Rose, "Empoigner," 135.

¹⁹⁷ Rose, "Empoigner," 136.

¹⁹⁸ Rose, "Empoigner," 136, 142.

and Aaron. It is more likely that Deut 32:48-52 is not original but borrowed from Num 27:12-14, and is modified by the redactors of Deuteronomy, as Ludwig Schmidt and Siegfried Mittmann argue that Num 27:12-14 was the *Vorlage* for Deut 32:48-52.¹⁹⁹ That is, Deut 32:48-52 was a later repetition of Num 27:12-14 with some “expansions” (*Erweiterungen*).²⁰⁰

Summary

In conclusion we may review a few points which we have been discussing in this section. The first of these would be the different contexts and syntax about the exclusion of Moses in Num 20:1-13; Num 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52. In Num 20:12, the leadership of Moses and Aaron is more emphasised in the Hiphil stem of בִּיָּא (“lead”) rather than the verb בִּיָּא in Qal stem (“enter”) in Deut 32:52. Thus, in Num 20:12, the punishment of Moses and Aaron is more of the removing of their leadership than of their exclusion. Moreover, the exclusion is not explicitly mentioned in Num 27:12-14, which says that Moses would be gathered to his people. The ban from the Promised Land is implied in the foretelling of Moses’ being gathered to his people. Such foretelling that Moses would be gathered to his people is changed to two commands in Deut 32:48-52. The syntax of Deut 32:48-52 suggests that the death of Moses is the direct punishment of failing to sanctify God. The exclusion of Moses from the Promised Land is a natural consequence of his

¹⁹⁹ Schmidt, *Numeri*, 166; Mittmann, *Deuteronomium*, 111.

²⁰⁰ Schmidt, *Numeri*, 167.

death, not a direct penalty of failing to sanctify YHWH.

The second point is that the chronological order of these three passages is Num 20:1-13; then Num 27:12-14; and the last Deut 32:48-52. We propose that Num 27:12-14 is later than Num 20:1-13 because the former presupposes the content of Num 20:1-13, and it has integrated the key expressions in Num 20:12 and Num 20:24. Deut 32:48-52 is said to be later than Num 27:12-14 because of the evidence of stylistic improvements and meaning clarifications in Deut 32:48-52. It rephrases Num 27:12-14 by using two explanatory subordination clauses. It also rewrites the infinitive of קרשׁ to a clause with קרשׁ in Piel perfect and with explicit negation. The meaning of the sins of Moses is then clarified in these modifications. Although Deut 32:48-52 is later than the three texts from Numbers, it does not mean that the whole book of Deuteronomy is later than the book of Numbers. It just shows that this passage of Deuteronomy is later than the three passages of Numbers. This diachronic relationship shows the possibility that Deut 32:48-52 is redacted by a later school.

Hence, the diachronic sequence of the texts are: Deut 1-3*, Deut 31:1-6, Deut 34:5a, Deut 4*, Num 20:12, Num 20:24, Num 27:12-14, Deut 32:48-52, and the last, Deut 34:4, 5b.

3. Observations on the two divine factors related to Moses' exclusion

A) Divine anger in the older texts

According to the above diachronic sequence of the texts, we find that the mentions of divine anger occur only in the older texts. Three times (Deut 1:37; 3:26-27; 4:21-22), Moses said that YHWH was angry with him.²⁰¹ How could Moses know that YHWH was angry with him? What did Moses mean when he said that YHWH was angry with him? How should we understand “angry/ furious with me” in the context? Why did Moses say that YHWH was angry? It can be noticed that the anger of YHWH is followed by Moses' exclusion in each of these passages. Is there any relationship between the anger of YHWH and Moses' exclusion? It seems that it is not a coincidence that divine anger and Moses' exclusion are found together three times. If there is a relationship, what is it? It is not likely to be a logical relation or “cause and effect” relation. In the Hebrew Bible, YHWH would get angry with different individuals, but not everyone of them will be excluded from the Promised Land. They might be punished in other ways. For instance, in Deut 9:20, Moses said that YHWH was angry enough with Aaron to destroy him.²⁰² In 1 Kgs 11:9-11, it is told that YHWH was angry with Solomon, and YHWH said to him that He would tear the kingdom away from Solomon and give it to one of Solomon's servants.²⁰³

²⁰¹ Different words are used: אָנִי (“to be angry”) in Deut 1:37; 4:21; and עָבַר (“to be furious”) in 3:26.

²⁰² In Deut 1:37 and 9:20, the same verb אָנִי (“to be angry”) is used.

²⁰³ The same verb אָנִי is used in 1 Kgs 11:9. Other consequences of divine anger include banishment from YHWH's presence (2 Kgs 17:18 with verb אָנִי) and destruction of the Israelites (Deut 9:8, Ezra

Since the anger of YHWH is repeated three times, this indicates that divine anger should be an important motif for the exclusion of Moses,²⁰⁴ or it is fair to say that the concept of divine anger is related to Moses' exclusion. This research will first find out whether there is a relationship between the anger of YHWH and the exclusion of Moses. If there is a relationship, what is it?

B) Divine holiness in the post-Priestly texts

Num 20:12, 27:12-14; Deut 32:48-52 do not refer to the spy narrative, but to the incident at the waters of Meribath Kadesh. This group states clearly that Moses had done something wrong.²⁰⁵ Has Moses sinned? The fault/ transgression of Moses in these three passages is represented by different terms: "breaking faith" with YHWH (Deut 32:51), "rebellious" against the word of YHWH (Num 27:14), and "not

9:14 with verb אָנַף). In other cases with different Hebrew verbs of "to be angry," the consequences include destruction of the Israelites (Deut 9:19 with verb קָנַף), defilement of YHWH's heritage (Isa 47:6 with verb קָנַף), abandoning the Israelites (Deut 31:17 with the combination of אָנַף חָרַף), and handing the Israelites over to foes (Judg 2:14 with the combination of אָנַף חָרַף).

²⁰⁴ As this factor is related to God, it is described as a "divine factor" in this study.

²⁰⁵ Scholars have tried to find out the sin of Moses for such severe punishment. The works by Jacob Milgrom and Johnson Lim have already provided systematic classifications of the sin of Moses and Aaron. Milgrom summarizes the ten explanations given by the medieval Jewish commentators on the sin of Moses: 1) striking the rock instead of speaking; 2) striking the rock following his choice, but the choice of the people; 3) striking the rock twice instead of once (these three are subsumed to Moses' action); 4) his blazing temper; 5) his cowardice; 6) his callousness (these three are under the aspect of Moses' character); 7) asking a question which was misconstrued as doubting God; 8) doubting God actually; 9) calling the Israelites "rebels"; 10) saying "shall we draw forth..." (these last four are related to Moses' words). See Jacob Milgrom, "Magic, Monotheism and the Sin of Moses," in *The Quest for the Kingdom of God: Studies in honor of George E. Mendenhall* (ed. H. B. Huffmon et al.; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1983), 251-265; idem, *Numbers* (JPSTC; Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1989), 448. Lim also classifies the sin of Moses under five aspects: 1) the speech of Moses; 2) the misuse of Aaron's staff; 3) surrendering of leadership responsibility; 4) speech during the performance of a miracle; 5) striking the rock. Johnson T. K. Lim, *The Sin of Moses and the Staff of God: A Narrative Approach* (Assen, Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1997), 109-133. But their studies are mainly confined to Num 20:1-13 only, and do not give much discussion on the exclusion of Moses in Deut 1-4.

believing” in YHWH (Num 20:12). What is the relationship between these three verbs? Do these three different verbs present one and the same fault of Moses?

Although the descriptions of the transgressions are different, all these actions are followed by: “not regarding God as holy.” The verb קדש (“to sanctify” or “to regard something/ someone as holy”) is repeated three times.²⁰⁶ What is the precise meaning of קדש? Is failing to sanctify God a consequence of the fault of Moses? Rather, is it a representation of his fault(s)/ transgression(s)?

It can be observed that there are juxtapositions of failing to sanctify God and Moses’ exclusion.²⁰⁷ Is there any relationship between “sanctifying God” and the ban of Moses? If the three-fold juxtapositions are not by accident, there may be a relationship between them. What is the relationship between failing to sanctify God and Moses’ denial?²⁰⁸ There is no indepth discussion of such sin and punishment in the previous studies.²⁰⁹

The lack of attention given to divine anger and holiness is deemed to be a blind spot in previous scholarship. In fact, this overlooking of the divine factors is very

²⁰⁶ The verb קדש (“to sanctify”) exists in different stems: Piel in Deut 32:51; Hiphil infinitive construct in Num 20:12 and Num 27:14; Niphal in Num 20:13. The differences will be discussed in Part III of this dissertation.

²⁰⁷ The exclusion of Moses is implied when YHWH said that Moses would be gathered to his people in Num 27:13.

²⁰⁸ Moses and Aaron are the only two persons of whom are said that they did not sanctify YHWH in the Hebrew Bible, in which there are 16 occurrences where YHWH is the direct or implied object of the verb “to sanctify” (Lev 10:3; 22:32; Num 20:12, 13; 27:14; Deut 32:51; Isa 5:16; 8:13; 29:23; Ezek 20:41; 28:22; 28:25; 36:23; 38:16; 38:23; 39:27.). Five of these 16 occurrences are used with human subjects (Num 20:12; 27:14; Deut 32:51; Isa 8:13; 29:23.), the rest are with divine subject, i.e.: YHWH sanctifies himself. A more detailed analysis of the usage of this verb “to sanctify” will be provided in Part IV of this study.

²⁰⁹ Lee has pointed out that the term “holiness” is related to YHWH’s reason for punishing Moses and Aaron in Num 20:12. He has also analyzed the usage of the verb “to sanctify” to find out the essence of Moses’ sin. But Lee does not state clearly the relationship between divine holiness and Moses’ exclusion. See Lee, “Conceptual Approach,” 224, 235.

common among the major Deuteronomy commentaries. Although the anger of YHWH (Deut 1:37; 3:26) is commented, there is no attempt to investigate its possible relationship to the denial of Moses.²¹⁰ The verb “to sanctify” in Deut 32:51 is noted, but it is merely interpreted as a “word-play” to the place name Kadesh, without asking the question of its relationship to Moses’ exclusion.²¹¹

Previous research fails to take into account that there may be possible relationships between YHWH’s anger and the ban of Moses, nor does it pay enough attention to why failing to sanctify God would lead to Moses’ denial. The aim of this study is to investigate the relationships between the exclusion of Moses and divine

²¹⁰ Cairns, *Deuteronomy*, 37; Christensen, *Deuteronomy 1-11*, 66; Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 127; Dillmann, *Deuteronomium*, 240; Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 27; Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 182, 227; Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 147; Perlitt, *Deuteronomium*, 119; Rose, *5. Mose 1-11 und 26-34*, 485; Smith, *Deuteronomy*, 24; Steuernagel, *Deuteronomium*, 6; Veijola, *Deuteronomium*, 41, 92-93; Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1-11*, 190; G. E. Wright, “Deuteronomy,” 339-340.

²¹¹ Bertholet, *Deuteronomium*, 102; Blenkinsopp, “Deuteronomy,” 108; Cairns, *Deuteronomy*, 292; Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 385; Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 395; Smith, *Deuteronomy*, 360. Regarding the Numeri version (Num 20:1-13; 27:12-14) most of the commentators also comment on the “word-play” or etymology of “to sanctify” (Num 20:12; 27:14) and “Kadesh” (Num 20:1; 27:14), but not on the possible linkage between “to sanctify” and Moses’ exclusion. See B. Baentsch, *Exodus Leviticus und Numeri* (HKAT 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903), 570; L. E. Elliott-Binns, *The book of Numbers: with Introduction and Notes* (London: Methuen & Co., 1927), 133; Philip J. Budd, *Numbers* (WBC; Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1984), 219; Eryl W. Davies, *Numbers* (NCBC; Grand Rapids; Mich: Eerdmans, 1995), 206; Dillmann, *Numeri*, 114; Thomas B. Dozeman, “The Book of Numbers,” in *The New Interpreter’s Bible Vol. II* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1998), 160; G. B. Gray, *Numbers* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1903), 263; R. P. Knierim and G. W. Coats, *Numbers* (FOTL 4; Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 2005), 228; Baruch A. Levine, *Numbers 1-20* (AB 4; New York: Doubleday, 1993), 490; Conrad E. L’Heureux, “Numbers,” in *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary* (ed. R. E. Brown et al.; Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1990), 87; John Marsh, “The Book of Numbers,” in *The Interpreter’s Bible, Vol. II* (ed. G. A. Buttrick et al.; Nashville: Abingdon, 1953), 239; James L. Mays, *Leviticus Numbers* (LBC; London: SCM, 1963), 111; A. H. McNeile, *The Books of Numbers* (CBSC; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911), 107; M. Noth, *Numbers* (trans. J. D. Martin; OTL; London: SCM, 1968), 147; trans. of *Das vierte Buch Mose, Numeri* (ATD 7; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966); Regarding the possibility of word play, Noth comments that it is scarcely likely that P uses the word “to sanctify” to make a play on the place name Kadesh. But a later writer makes such play in Num 20:13; J. Scharbert, *Numeri* (NEB 27; Würzburg: Echter, 1992), 81; Horst Seebass, *Numeri Teilband 2: Numeri 10,11-22,1* (BKAT 4/2; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2003), 283; N. H. Snaith, *Leviticus and Numbers* (CB; London: Nelson, 1967), 276; John Sturdy, *Numbers* (CBC; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 140; Gordon J. Wenham, *Numbers* (TOTC; Leicester: IVP, 1981), 151; Ka-Leung Wong, *Book of Numbers* (Hong Kong: Logos, 2008) (Chinese), 252.

anger on the one hand, and sanctifying God on the other. Before we start our investigation, we will see a review of scholarship on these two divine themes in the next chapter.

Chapter Three. Review of Scholarship

The purpose of the present chapter is to answer two questions. First, what is the source of Num 20:1-13; 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52? Are they Priestly writings?

We will attempt to clarify their source(s) by reviewing the current discussions on the Priestly nature of these three texts. Second, can the current scholarships of divine anger and sanctifying God provide bases for our study? In the previous chapter, by paying attention to the repeated key words in the different passages, we have arrived at an initial observation that the themes of divine anger and sanctifying God are related to Moses' exclusion. What are the current studies on these two themes? How can we understand these themes in Deuteronomy? We will first deal with the theme of divine anger since we have observed that divine anger is connected to the ban of Moses from the Promised Land in the first four chapters of Deuteronomy. Then we will review the studies on sanctifying God at the last part of this chapter.

1. Review of scholarship on the Priestly nature of Num 20:1-13, Num 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52

(1) The mixture of Priestly and non-Priestly language in Num 20:1-13,

27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52¹

Thirty years ago,² the dominant view among scholars is that Num 20:1-13; 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52 all come from the Priestly source.³ According to Theodor Nöldeke, whom Wellhausen regards as the first who has traced in detail how the Priestly writing runs through the whole Hexateuch,⁴ the style of P (the *Grundschrift* of Nöldeke) is with frequent repetitions, but it does not have vividness

¹ The expression “non-Priestly” is understood by its relation with the Priestly writing, which develops the themes on creation (Gen 1:1-2:3), covenant (Gen 9:1-17; 17:1-27; Exod 6:2-7:7) and cultic practice (Exod 12:1-20; 25-31; Lev) with its distinctive style. The non-Priestly writing constitutes the remainder of the Tetrateuch, containing a much more diverse body of literature with distinct themes that suggest a more complex history of composition than the Priestly writing. See Thomas B. Dozeman, *The Pentateuch: Introducing the Torah* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2017), 194-195.

² That is before the influential essay of Lothar Perlitt, “Priesterschrift im Deuteronomium?,” *ZAW* 100 (1988): 65-88.

³ The scholars who support the Priestly nature of Num 20:1-13* include Nöldeke, Wellhausen, Cornill, Baentsch, Gray, McNeile, Smend, Driver, Simpson, Anderson, Noth, de Vaulx and Lohfink. See Nöldeke, *Untersuchungen*, 83-84; Julius Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuch* (4th ed.; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1963), 106-108; Cornill, “Beiträge zur Pentateuchkritik,” *ZAW* 11 (1891): 20-34; Baentsch, *Numeri*, 564-565; Gray, *Numbers*, 258-263; McNeile, *Numbers*, 105-107; Rudolf Smend, *Die Erzählung des Hexateuch: auf ihre Quellen untersucht* (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1912), 205; S. R. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (9th ed.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1913), 66; C. A. Simpson, *The Early Traditions of Israel: A Critical Analysis of the Pre-deuteronomiac Narrative of the Hexateuch* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1948), 243-248; G. W. Anderson, *A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament* (London: Gerald Duckworth, 1959), 46; Noth, *Numbers*, 144; J. de Vaulx, *Les Nombres* (SB; Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1972), 223; Norbert Lohfink, “The Priestly Narrative and History,” in *Theology of the Pentateuch: Themes of the Priestly Narrative and Deuteronomy* (trans. Linda M. Maloney; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 145.

Num 27:12-14 is also said to be a product of Priestly School since it is parallel to Num 20:12. See Budd, *Numbers*, 305; Davies, *Numbers*, 302; Dozeman, “Numbers,” 219; Gray, *Numbers*, 399; J. Scharbert, *Numeri*, 112; Rolf P. Knierim and George W. Coats, *Numbers* (FOTL 4; Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 2005), 277; Mays, *Numbers*, 132; McNeile, *Numbers*, 153; Nöldeke, *Untersuchungen*, 89, 144; Noth, *Numbers*, 213; Wellhausen, *Composition*, 113. Mittmann disagrees that Num 27:12-14 is totally from P. He thinks that Num 27:13a-14a is a later addition. See Siegfried Mittmann, *Deuteronomium 1,1-6,3: literarkritisch und traditionsgeschichtlich untersucht* (BZAW 139; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1975), 108-110.

Deut 32:48-52 is parallel to Num 27:12-14, and in both language and content it belongs to the Priestly tradition. See Bertholet, *Deuteronomium*, 101-102; Blenkinsopp, “Deuteronomy,” 108; Georg Braulik, *Deuteronomium II*, 236; Buis and Leclercq, *Le Deutéronome*, 203; Cairns, *Deuteronomy*, 291; Dillmann, *Deuteronomium*, 413 (Dillmann uses the symbol “A” to represent the Priestly document.); Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 382-383; Levinson, “Deuteronomy,” 423; Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 911; Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 394; Miller, *Deuteronomy*, 242; Moran, “Deuteronomy,” 275; Nielsen, *Deuteronomium*, 285; Nöldeke, *Untersuchungen*, 144; Phillips, *Deuteronomy*, 222; von Rad, *Deuteronomy*, 201; Smith, *Deuteronomy*, 25, 359; Steuernagel, *Deuteronomium*, 122; Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 317, 518; Wellhausen, *Composition*, 113, 166, 206; G. E. Wright, “Deuteronomy,” 526.

⁴ Julius Wellhausen, “Pentateuch and Joshua,” *EncBrit* 9th ed. 18:506.

and warmth of language.⁵ There is no detailed characterization on the persons in the narrative, they are only drawn in outline.⁶ Alberto Soggin also says that P is the easiest to recognize because of its relatively consistent vocabulary, its solemn style, and its love of elements connected with the cult.⁷ Most parts of Num 20:1-13 are classified to be Priestly by the criteria of vocabulary, style and theology. The signs of Priestly authorship can be summarised as:⁸

- i) The usage of priestly terms: **העדה** (“the congregation,” in vv. 1, 2, 8, 11) and **גוע** (“perish,” in v. 3);
- ii) The presence of Aaron beside Moses (vv. 2, 6, 8, 10, 12);
- iii) The falling on faces of Moses and Aaron (v.6, see Num 14:5; 16:4, 22);
- iv) The appearance of glory of YHWH (v.6. cf. Num 14:10; 16:19; 17:7);
- v) The stress upon the power of the word of God (v.8, see Genesis 1);
- vi) The importance of sanctification (vv. 12, 13);
- vii) The location of the tent of meeting, which seems to be at the center of the camp (v.6).

Although there is evidence for the Priestly nature of Num 20:1-13, two points should be noted. First, the fact that a Priestly passage emphasizes the power of the word of God does not prove that only Priestly texts stress this theme or that a passage with a

⁵ Nöldeke, *Untersuchungen*, 133.

⁶ Nöldeke, *Untersuchungen*, 133.

⁷ J. Alberto Soggin, *Introduction to the Old Testament: From its Origins to the Closing of the Alexandrian Canon* (3d ed; trans. J. Bowden; Louisville, Kent.: Westminster/ John Knox Press, 1989), 150.

⁸ W. H. Propp, *Water in the Wilderness* (HSM40; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 67-68, 92.

theme of the power of God must be a Priestly writing. For example, Deut 8:3 states that "...[H]e might make you know that man does not live by bread alone, but man lives by every word that comes from the mouth of YHWH." This Deuteronomic text also stresses the power of the word of God, and it is certainly not a Priestly text. This awareness should also apply to some of the above signs of Priestly authorship, such as "presence of Aaron," "the appearance of the glory of God" and so on. The classification of a passage to be Priestly should not be a mechanical process. However, the accumulation of identical style and theology does increase the possibility of the Priestly nature of a passage.

Second, vocabulary and style are used as the criteria for proving the Priestly nature of Num 20:1-13, 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52. However, these same criteria can also be used to prove that these three passages are not purely Priestly writings. Long time ago, it has been observed that not all parts of Num 20:1-13 are Priestly. For instance, Dillmann argues that Num 20:1b, 3a, 5, 7-8* and 11 are non-Priestly because of unusual Priestly vocabulary.⁹ Recently, the works of Christophe Nihan and Lothar Perlitt put forward more dimensions of consideration.

Christophe Nihan on Num 20:1-13

Christophe Nihan argues that Num 20:1-13 is a composition by a late post-Priestly author for three reasons.¹⁰ First, there are atypical of Priestly

⁹ Dillmann, *Numeri*, 110-113.

¹⁰ Nihan, *Priestly Torah*, 25, 29.

expressions, for example, the designation of Israel as קהל יהוה (“assembly of YHWH”) in Num 20:4 is never found in P but only in Deut 23 (vv. 2, 3, 4, 9) and Num 16:3.¹¹ The use of עלה (“to come up”) with reference to the exodus in Num 20:5 is not normal of P.¹² The use of the plural form of the Qal participle המרים (“rebels”) in Num 20:10 is also not typically Priestly.¹³ Hence his first reason is also based on the criterion of vocabulary.

Second, textural comparison shows that a few verses of Num 20:1-13 are formed by the combination of other non-P verses. For example, Num 20:5 appears to combine both Num 13:23 and 16:14, two non-P passages.¹⁴ Num 20:11a is “modeled upon several passages describing Moses’ action as a miracle worker in the book of Exodus.”¹⁵

Third, there are expressions which are based on secondary texts. For example, the use of the verb נָיַע (“perish”) in Num 20:3 is “reminiscent” of Num 17:27-28 which bridges Num 17 and Num 18 and has a “marked editorial character.”¹⁶ “The staff before YHWH” in Num 20:9 is a clear allusion to Aaron’s staff in the story of Num 17:16-26, which is generally held to be secondary to P.¹⁷ Thus, for Nihan, Num 20:1-13 is post-Priestly, hence not Priestly. Therefore, one cannot deny the presence of both the Priestly and non-Priestly language in Num 20:1-13. There is a

¹¹ Nihan, *Priestly Torah*, 28.

¹² Nihan, *Priestly Torah*, 28-29.

¹³ Nihan, *Priestly Torah*, 29.

¹⁴ Nihan, *Priestly Torah*, 29.

¹⁵ Nihan, *Priestly Torah*, 29.

¹⁶ Nihan, *Priestly Torah*, 28.

¹⁷ Nihan, *Priestly Torah*, 29.

mixture of P and non-P language in the passage. Nihan assigns Num 20:1-13 to be post-Priestly by detailed observations on the phraseology and style of the passage, and most of his arguments are convincing.¹⁸

Lothar Perlitt on Deut 32:48-52

The mixing of language of Deut 32:48-52 is observed by Lothar Perlitt. In his essay, Perlitt states that Deut 1:3; 32:48-52 and 34:1a, 7-9 were composed by scribal redactors who mixed the Deuteronomistic language with the Priestly language.¹⁹ He observes that there are differences between Deut 32:48-52 and Num 27:12-14. If Deut 32:48-52 is later than Num 27:12-14,²⁰ then the variances imply that the redactor of Deut 32:48-52 has modified the Priestly writing of Num 27:12-14. For example, the verb אָמַר (“to say”) in Num 27:12 is changed to דָּבַר (“to speak”) in Deut 32:48. Some words that were inserted by the redactor (such as “on the same day,” “land of Canaan” and “a possession”) do not necessarily come from P.²¹ Other schools of tradition can also use such words or phrases. The redactor can expand or

¹⁸ However, one of his arguments is not without difficulty. Nihan excludes the Priestly character of Num 20: 3-5, 10 by the observation on the different usages of words and style. It should be pointed out that the speakers of 20:3b-5 are the Israelites, and the speaker of verse 10 is Moses, not the “Priestly” narrator. The Israelites and Moses are not representatives of the Priestly School. According to the narrative, the Israelites were murmuring and Moses was rebuking the Israelites. The Israelites can complain without the Priestly style. It is also arguable that if Moses is rebuking the people, his personal style will appear in such an emotional situation. He might rebuke others without using Priestly language. It is not necessary to assume that the Priestly redactors would edit *everything* to their style including complaints and rebukes. The Priestly redactors might use or keep the “foreign” materials in the texts with which they did not agree theologically. However, this discussion does not negate the main conclusion of Nihan.

¹⁹ Lothar Perlitt, “Priesterschrift im Deuteronomium?,” *ZAW* 100 (1988): 65-88.

²⁰ Perlitt does not state this clearly, but it seems that he has assumed this.

²¹ Perlitt, “Priesterschrift,” 73, 75.

modify Deut 32:48-52 with all sorts of learned traditions and make them fit his current context.²² Hence, according to Perlitt, Deut 32:48-52 is not dependent only on Num 27:12-14. The intention of revising Num 27:12-14 in Deut 32:48-52 is not to repeat the Priestly source, but to combine and connect itself with the book of Deuteronomy.²³ The scribal school in the post-exilic period would blend the phraseology and style of the Deuteronomic School with that of Priestly School.

Based on Perlitt's work, we can suggest that the redactors could have thought certain character was typical of Priestly language, and certain was typical of Deuteronomic, and deliberately imitated it. Thus, the later school was influenced by more than one school, and the theologies were blended. Hence, the Priestly elements in Deut 32:48-52 do not necessarily signify a Priestly redactor behind the text.

The above works of Nihan and Perlitt have pointed out the mixture of Priestly and non-Priestly language in Num 20:1-13 and Deut 32:48-52. How do other scholars explain the fact of the mixing of language of different schools? If the mixture of Priestly and Deuteronomic language of Deut 32:48-52 could be understood differently in the frame of the book of Deuteronomy, could these three texts be also interpreted differently in the frame of Numbers and Deuteronomy or even the Pentateuch? Since the book of Numbers and Deuteronomy are discussed together with the formation of the Pentateuch in current scholarship, the understanding of the mixture of Priestly and non-Priestly language in these three

²² Perlitt, "Priesterschrift," 72.

²³ Perlitt, "Priesterschrift," 74.

passages will be discussed in the frame of the formation of the Pentateuch.

Thomas Pola's argument on the end of P

Because some of the proposals of the formation of the Pentateuch are built on Thomas Pola's conclusion, it will be necessary to introduce his arguments about the end of P before looking at the models. Pola suggests that the end of P is in Exodus 40.²⁴ He finds that the materials in Numbers and Deuteronomy do not bring a fulfillment to the promise in the Priestly basic writing (P^G, *Die priesterliche Grundschrift*) in Genesis 17.²⁵ The so-called "Priestly passages" in Numbers and Deuteronomy contain several strange features which are unusual to P^G.²⁶ Hence, Pola claims that there is no Priestly text in Numbers and Deuteronomy. He proposes that the promise of the Priestly texts is fulfilled at Mount Sinai, and the ending of P^G is in Exodus 40.²⁷ There is no consensus about the ending of the Priestly document.²⁸ The following models are selected because they can represent the diversity of the approaches to the formation of the Pentateuch.

²⁴ Pola, *Die ursprüngliche*, 353.

²⁵ Pola, *Die ursprüngliche*, 353.

²⁶ Pola, *Die ursprüngliche*, 353.

²⁷ Pola, *Die ursprüngliche*, 353.

²⁸ Blum, "Issues," 40. The end of P does not necessarily coincide with a certain presupposed concept of Priestly writing. Scholars have found evidence to locate the end of P at "the foundation of the cult" or "the dwelling among the Israelites" or "the death of Moses" or "the settlement of the land." But so far, all the evidence is arguable, and arguments proposed to support them are inevitably circular. Ska also points out that the argumentation often runs the risk of being circular: research proceeds from a "concept" that determines the nature of P in order to identify the corresponding texts and, at the same time, it defines the nature of P on the basis of these same texts. See Ska, *Pentateuch*, 148. In other words, some scholars judge the scope and range of the P by the theology of the Priestly writing. But the theology of P is also determined by the scope and range of the Priestly writings. Therefore, it may be unwise to argue for an absolute end of P.

(2) Four opinions on the mixing of P and non-P language in Num 20:1-13;
27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52

(a) Reinhard Kratz's model

In the model of Reinhard Kratz, the mixture of P and non-P language is due to the formation of the Enneateuch. Kratz thinks that the first end of the basic document P^G is the story of the foundation of the sanctuary in Exod 40.²⁹ According to Kratz, the book of Leviticus is the secondary extension of the law, and Lev 26 (with 27 as an appendix) is the second conclusion of the Priestly writing.³⁰ Thus the main themes of the Priestly writing are “creation,” “patriarchs and exodus,” and “the foundation of the sanctuary.” The “creation” of the world focuses on the covenant with Noah, which guarantees the survival of the world. The “patriarchs and exodus” fuse in the covenant with Abraham, which guarantees that God will be God for Israel. “The foundation of the sanctuary” on Sinai let the people communicate with God by the cult instructed in Lev 1-27.³¹

Later, this Priestly writing was worked into the already existing literary complex of the Enneateuch. Supplements to the Priestly writing were added during

²⁹ Reinhard G. Kratz, *The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament* (trans. J. Bowden; London: T&T Clark; New York: Continuum, 2005); trans. of *Die Komposition der erzählenden Bücher des Alten Testaments: Grundwissen der Bibelkritik* (Uni-Taschenbücher 2157; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000).

³⁰ Kratz, *Composition*, 110.

³¹ Kratz, *Composition*, 110.

this reworking. Such expansions hover between P and D in language and theology, sometimes more Priestly, sometimes more Deuteronomic, and sometimes a mixture of the two.³² Kratz states that since the Priestly writing in Numbers already presupposes the non-priestly context of Num 20-24 and Deuteronomy, this part of Priestly writing is a redactional stratum.³³ Num 20 and 27 were inserted by the redactors, and other supplements in Numbers were added with a mixture of Priestly-Deuteronomic tone.

Kratz locates the time for the independent Priestly writing around 500 BCE, the combination of P with JE and the expansions in the framework of the Enneateuch in the fifth or fourth century BCE, the expansion process finished with the separation of the Pentateuch from the books of the Former Prophets.³⁴ Hence, according to Kratz, Num 20:1-13; Num 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52 are post-Priestly, and the amalgamation of P and D language are caused by the supplements to the Priestly writing.

(b) The model of Eckart Otto

Eckart Otto does not suggest an Enneateuch model, but about the redactions of the Hexateuch and the Pentateuch. His model is sufficiently complicated that a brief summary will not show its uniqueness. It can be summarised by the following table.

³² Kratz, *Composition*, 321.

³³ Kratz, *Composition*, 112.

³⁴ Kratz, *Composition*, 321.

Stage	Name of Stage	Redactor	Time	Place	The part of Pentateuch formed and named
1 st	Formation of pre-exilic Deuteronomy	Priestly intellectuals	700 BCE	Jerusalem	Deut 6:4-5; 12-26*; 28* (As a loyalty oath to YHWH)
2 nd	Horeb Redaction (DtrD)	Priestly scribes	Exile, the first generation	Babylonia	Deut 5; 9-10*; 26* (Introduction formation)
3 rd	Moab Redaction (DtrL)	Priestly scribes	Exile, the second generation	Babylonia	Deut 1-3*; Deut 29-30; Josh 1-11*; 23* and Judg 2:6-9 (Frame formation)
4 th	Hexateuch Redaction	Post-exilic scribes	500 BCE	Jerusalem	Integration of P (Gen1-Lev 9) to DtrL (Hexateuch formation)
5 th	Pentateuch Redaction	Scribes from the Persian Diaspora	450 BCE	Jerusalem	The Book of Joshua was removed. Decalogue, the Book of Covenant and Lev 17-26 (H) were inserted. Deut 31-34 as the conclusion of the Torah (Pentateuch formation)

According to Otto, in the first stage the pre-exilic Deuteronomy (Deut 6:4-5; Deut 12-25* and Deut 28:20-44*)³⁵ was circulated in a small group of Priestly intellectuals in Jerusalem,³⁶ and was formed by the process of “secularization of the state”³⁷ and “theologization of ethics.”³⁸

³⁵ Eckart Otto, “The Pivotal Meaning of Pentateuch Research for a History of Israelite and Jewish Religion and Society,” in *South African Perspectives on the Pentateuch between Synchrony and Diachrony* (ed. E. Otto and J. LeRoux; London; New York: T&T Clark International, 2007), 39.

³⁶ Otto, “Synchronical and Diachronical,” 20.

³⁷ The process of “secularization of the state” happened in the seventh century BCE when Judean intellectuals drew on and transformed important texts of the Neo-Assyrian royal ideology, especially the loyalty oath of the Assyrian King Esarhaddon of 672 BCE. The loyalty oath to the Assyrian King is transformed to a loyalty oath to YHWH. The Judean intellectuals created an entirely new paradigm which limited the claim to political loyalty by requiring absolute loyalty towards God. They shifted the obligation of absolute loyalty from Assyrian king to YHWH. Regarding the Assyrian “state” ideology, it was impossible to suppose that humans could have any rights over against the state. If the claim for absolute loyalty was shifted from king (representative of the state) to YHWH, the people ought to obey YHWH rather than the king. This became the “secularization of the state.” See Otto,

Then the Deuteronomists of the first generation in exile combined the pre-exilic Deuteronomy with the law in Mount Horeb in Deut 5; 9-10*; 26*, and added the blessings to the curses in Deut 28 in the second stage which is called the “Horeb redaction.”³⁹ The redactors expanded the Decalogue, then they organized the Deuteronomic law as the speech of Moses at Horeb.⁴⁰

In the third stage (“the Moab redaction”) the Deuteronomists of the second generation in exile first shifted the promulgation of the Deuteronomic law and the making of the covenant to the plains of Moab in Deut 29.⁴¹ They then added a narrative of the wandering of the Israelites in Deut 1-3, and connected this framed Deut 1-29 with the Book of Joshua to form a literary unity from Deut 1 to Josh 23,⁴² which was a narrative of the fulfillment of God’s promise to return home for the second generation in exile.⁴³ According to Otto, the frame of Deuteronomy formed by the Moab redaction was aimed at solving the problem of the injustice. A new generation of the Israelites grew up in exile. They asked for justice because it was not they who had failed and caused the disaster of exile.⁴⁴ The “land” is the central

“Pivotal Meaning,” 32-36.

³⁸ During the Neo-Assyrian crisis, the Assyrian deportation of Judeans and the resettlement of the devastated rural areas destroyed the structure of extended families in the Judean countryside. Consequently, the system of genealogically based kinship collapsed. At that time, Hebrew ethics were legitimated by genealogies. In the process of “theologization of ethics,” the Urdeuteronomium as a reform programme revising the Covenant Code offered the answer to the collapse of the system of traditional ethics. See Otto, “Pivotal Meaning,” 37.

³⁹ Otto, “Pivotal Meaning,” 39.

⁴⁰ Otto, “Pentateuch,” 9: 687.

⁴¹ Otto, “Pentateuch,” 9: 687.

⁴² Otto, “Pivotal Meaning,” 39; idem, *Deuteronomium 1,1-4,43*, 244.

⁴³ Otto, “Pivotal Meaning,” 43.

⁴⁴ Otto, “Pivotal Meaning,” 42.

theme of this redaction.⁴⁵

The fourth stage is called “Hexateuch redaction.” The redactors were post-exilic Priestly scribes in the middle of the fifth century BCE, during the period of Nehemiah’s activity in Jerusalem.⁴⁶ According to Otto, Deuteronomy (redacted by the Zadokites) and the Priestly Code⁴⁷ (written by the Aaronides) represent two programmes with divergent concepts of “Israel’s origins, history and future.”⁴⁸ For the post-exilic scribes, God’s will related to Israel’s ethics could only be one because God was one. Thus the scribes had to combine these two programmes.⁴⁹ According to this redaction, the “land” was the most decisive gift YHWH had given to his people.⁵⁰ The goal of creation and history was Israel’s dwelling securely in its own land.⁵¹

The wilderness narratives in Num 20, according to Otto, were added by the redactor of Hexateuch in the period of Nehemiah.⁵² He thinks that the Hexateuch redactor added Num 20:1-13 with v.12 as the focus because he had to balance “the main roles” in Deut 1- Judg 2:9 (Moses and Joshua) and P (Moses and Aaron) in the context of the connection of P with Deut 1- Judg 2:9.⁵³

⁴⁵ Otto, “Pentateuch,” 9: 688.

⁴⁶ Otto, “Synchronical and Diachronical,” 29; Otto, “Pivotal Meaning,” 49.

⁴⁷ For Otto, the Priestly source presents an outline of universal history. Gen 1, which is on creation, is the beginning of P. Gen 1-11 “calls attention to the goal of creation and the world history.” P ends in Exod 29:42-46. The goal of world history is that God dwells in the midst of Israel. P was a product in the exilic period. The book of Numbers was post-exilic and not from the Priestly source. See Otto, “Pentateuch,” 9:688.

⁴⁸ Otto, “Pivotal Meaning,” 47-48.

⁴⁹ Otto, “Synchronical and Diachronical,” 27.

⁵⁰ Otto, “Synchronical and Diachronical,” 31; Otto, “Pivotal Meaning,” 49.

⁵¹ Otto, “Pentateuch,” 9: 689.

⁵² Otto, “Pentateuch,” 9:689.

⁵³ Eckart Otto, *Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und Hexateuch: Studien zur Literaturgeschichte*

The last stage is called the “Pentateuch redaction.” The redactors were the post-exilic scribal priests who came from the Persian diaspora⁵⁴ in the fourth century BCE, during the period of Ezra’s mission to Yehud.⁵⁵ During the Pentateuch redaction, the Book of Joshua was removed and the first version of Pentateuch (from Gen 1 to Deut 34) was created.⁵⁶ The interest of the Pentateuch redaction is very different from that of the Hexateuch redaction.⁵⁷ It places the Sinai pericope in the middle of the Pentateuch.⁵⁸ In this redaction, the revelation of the Torah was the purpose of creation of the world and world history.⁵⁹ This redaction supplemented the Sinai periscope, integrating the Decalogue and Covenant Code in Exod 20-23 and creating Lev 17-26 (the Holiness Code).⁶⁰ This redaction provides an idea that Israel’s identity should not be constituted by where they live, but by the way they live out the faith. The Jews should keep the Torah regardless of whether they lived in the Promised Land or in the diaspora.⁶¹ The result was a “Diaspora theology” that gave relatively less weight to the *land* than to the *Torah*.⁶² The “updates of tradition” (*Fortschreibungen*) of the Pentateuch redaction focuses on Deut 5-11 and Deut

von *Pentateuch und Hexateuch im Lichte des Deuteronomiumrahmens*, (FAT 30; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 133. Otto gives “DtrL” as the symbol of Deut 1- Judg 2:9 where “L” stands for the “Land.”

⁵⁴ Otto, “Synchronical and Diachronical,” 31.

⁵⁵ Otto, “Pivotal Meaning,” 51.

⁵⁶ Otto, “Synchronical and Diachronical,” 32; Otto, “Pivotal Meaning,” 48.

⁵⁷ Hexateuch redaction “take over” the connection of Deuteronomy with the book of Joshua, and this interest is similar to that of Moab redaction. See Otto, *Deuteronomium 1,1-4,43*, 254.

⁵⁸ Otto, “Pentateuch,” 9: 689; Otto, *Deuteronomium 1,1-4,43*, 254.

⁵⁹ Otto, “Synchronical and Diachronical,” 34.

⁶⁰ Otto, “Synchronical and Diachronical,” 31-32; Otto, “Pivotal Meaning,” 51.

⁶¹ Otto, “Synchronical and Diachronical,” 31; Otto, “Pivotal Meaning,” 51.

⁶² Otto, “Pentateuch,” 9: 689.

31-34* as the end of the entire Pentateuch.⁶³ Otto thinks that some other passages of Leviticus and Numbers were added after the Pentateuchal redaction. The Pentateuch was finally closed during the end of the 4th century BCE.⁶⁴

For Otto, Num 20:1-13 and Deut 32:48-52 were products of the Hexateuch redaction,⁶⁵ Num 27:12-14 was a later supplement after the Pentateuch redaction.⁶⁶ Therefore, the diachronic order of the three texts is: Num 20:1-13, Deut 32:48-52, and then Num 27:12-14.⁶⁷ All three are post-Priestly products. His model explains that the coexistence of the Priestly and non-Priestly language in the passages are due to the combination of the two different programmes under the faith of “One God.”⁶⁸

⁶³ Otto, *Deuteronomium 1,1-4,43*, 255.

⁶⁴ Otto, “Pentateuch,” 9:689.

⁶⁵ Otto, *Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und Hexateuch*, 224.

⁶⁶ Otto, *Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und Hexateuch*, 225.

⁶⁷ Otto’s conclusion on the chronological order of Num 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52 is not convincing. It is because some differences between Num 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52 may be well explained by that the Deuteronomic text alters the Numbers text, but not vice versa. The observations on the change of the explanatory conjunctions, and the change of the *להקדישני* (Num 27:14) to a subordinate clause *על אשר לא קדשתם אותי* (Deut 32:51) is an indication of a re-writing in Deut 32:51.

⁶⁸ As a student of Otto, Reinhard Achenbach has developed his reconstruction of the book of Numbers based on Otto’s hypothesis. Achenbach also agrees that the end of P is in the book of Exodus. The difference is that Achenbach focuses meticulously on the final process of the addition of the supplements after the Hexateuchal redaction and the Pentateuchal redaction. He proposes a three-stage “theocratic” revision after the Pentateuch redaction. The first stage was on the sanctuary, the constitution of Israel and the inheritance of the land. In the second stage, purity and ritual laws were inserted. In the third and final stage, “theocratic” legends and other redactions were added. According to Achenbach, Num 20:1-13 was mainly from the Pentateuch redaction. The death of Miriam at Kadesh (Num 20:1ab) was composed by post-exilic scribes, while the wandering to the wilderness of Zin (Num 20:1aa) and the story at the waters of Meribah (Num 20:2-13) were rewritten by the Pentateuch redactors. Deut 32:48-52 was from the Pentateuch redaction. Num 27:12-14 was from the first stage of “theocratic” revision. Thus, in Achenbach’s model, Deut 32:48-52 is earlier than Num 27:12-14. See R. Achenbach, *Die Vollendung der Tora: Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Numeribuches im Kontext von Hexateuch und Pentateuch* (BZAR 3; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2003), 302, 308, 324, 557-561, 636, 638.

(c) Thomas Römer's model

The mixture of P and non-P language can be explained by the model of Römer, who proposes that the book of Numbers was formed as a bridge between the Triteuch and Deuteronomy. Römer also accepts Perlitt's idea that Deut 32:48-52 is not a product from the Priestly School. He proposes that the book of Numbers is the last book formed in the Pentateuch. It was inserted as a bridge connecting the Tritoteuch (Genesis, Exodus and Leviticus) and Deuteronomy. Römer argues that Exodus and Leviticus were already closed when Numbers was formed because the content of Num 1-10 should be better fitted into Exodus and Leviticus (because these two books also contain a lot of legal texts and lists), "but had not been added into them."⁶⁹

Römer's view can be seen as an extended version of Martin Noth's view on the formation of the book of Numbers. Noth has already stated that the peculiar nature of the book of Numbers should be linked to the peculiar position and function of the book within the framework of the Pentateuch as a whole.⁷⁰ With the "bringing of the narratives of Num 20-21," the Pentateuch was approaching a close.⁷¹ For Noth, the last third of Numbers was a place where later insertions could be made when the Pentateuch had almost reached its conclusion.⁷² The place of insertion can be found

⁶⁹ Thomas C. Römer, "Israel's Sojourn in the Wilderness and the Conclusion of the Book of Numbers," in *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld* (ed. R. Rezetko et al.; VTSup 113; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 428-429.

⁷⁰ Noth, *Numbers*, 5.

⁷¹ Noth, *Numbers*, 7.

⁷² Noth, *Numbers*, 9.

in Numbers only because the other four books⁷³ were fixed. New passages could not be inserted into these four books. The book of Numbers had not been fixed yet at that time, and later insertions were added into it. For Römer, not just the last third of Numbers, but the whole book of Numbers was a later insertion.

According to Römer, the book of Numbers is a post-Priestly product. There are two main reasons. First, he accepts the idea that the end of P is in Lev 9 (the cult of Israel).⁷⁴ All materials later than Lev 9, including Numbers, must be post-Priestly. Second, the book of Numbers should be understood as reinterpretations of the positive accounts recorded in Exodus.⁷⁵ The wilderness narratives in the early prophets and the book of Exodus were originally *positive* accounts of YHWH's care for his people.⁷⁶ The Priestly source also represents this view.⁷⁷ However, the wilderness stories in Numbers are *negative*. Thus, this transformation from positive to negative is a sign of reinterpretations. Hence, the book of Numbers is post-Priestly.

Römer also borrows Noth's idea of "successive supplementation" and William McKane's theory of "rolling corpus" to explain the process of the formation of the book of Numbers. He states that the suggestion of "successive supplementation" may also apply partially to Num 11-20,⁷⁸ while the idea of "rolling corpus" may also

⁷³ Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus and Deuteronomy.

⁷⁴ Römer, "Israel's Sojourn," 426.

⁷⁵ Römer, "Israel's Sojourn," 432-433.

⁷⁶ Römer, "Israel's Sojourn," 430-432.

⁷⁷ Römer, "Israel's Sojourn," 432.

⁷⁸ Römer, "Israel's Sojourn," 436.

apply to other parts of the book of Numbers.⁷⁹ Focusing on the formation of Num 11-20, Römer makes the point that Deut 1 and Num 13-14 are the kernels for the growth of part of Num 11-20.⁸⁰ After Num 13-14 was formed, then Num 11:4-35 and Num 20:1-13 were added. Both passages are related to the theme of food and water as well as about Moses' revolt against YHWH.⁸¹ The addition of Num 11:4-35 and Num 20:1-13 "transformed" Exod 15-17 into rebellion accounts.⁸² Later, Num 12:2-9; 12:1; 12:10-15 and 11:1-3 were added. Finally, Num 16-17, 15 and 18-19 were supplemented to Num 11-20 in several stages.⁸³ Thus Römer presents Num 20:1-13 and Num 27:12-14 as post-Priestly, and the co-existence of P and non-P language is due to the bridging of Deuteronomy to the Triteuch.

(d) Israel Knohl's model

Israel Knohl's study is later than Perlitt's article by seven years, but he neither refers to it nor develops a new hypothesis based on Perlitt's view. However, it is still necessary to examine Knohl's view since his opinion has received a lot of attention and responses from scholars. Knohl's opinion is different from the traditional documentary hypothesis, according to which P is later than D and H (the Holiness School). Knohl argues that P is earlier than D and is edited by H. According to him,

⁷⁹ Römer, "Israel's Sojourn," 428, 436, 444.

⁸⁰ Römer, "Israel's Sojourn," 433-445.

⁸¹ Römer, "Israel's Sojourn," 435.

⁸² Römer, "Israel's Sojourn," 442.

⁸³ Römer, "Israel's Sojourn," 442.

even the Torah is edited by H.⁸⁴

Knohl claims that the Priestly Torah and the Holiness School are two different schools of thought.⁸⁵ The Priestly Torah was produced in the period between the erection of the temple of Solomon and the reigns of King Ahaz and Hezekiah.⁸⁶ His evidence includes the description of the tabernacle, the text which reflects the secured status of the priests, and the isolation of the priests from the people.⁸⁷ The Holiness School was formed when there was a change in Priestly circles during the reigns of King Ahaz and Hezekiah.⁸⁸ The content of Holiness School is against the background of the social-economic polarization and the religious crisis that developed in this period.⁸⁹

In the Priestly Torah, the commandments given at Sinai are related to the ritual-cultic sphere, but are not about social justice.⁹⁰ Such teaching of the Priestly Torah was criticized by the prophets.⁹¹ The Holiness School created the broader concept of holiness that integrates morality and cult, in order to respond the prophets' criticism.⁹² Knohl concludes that the Holiness School is later than the Priestly Torah,⁹³ and the Holiness School also redacted the P stratum.⁹⁴

⁸⁴ Israel Knohl, *The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995), 226. Knohl uses "HS" to represent "the Holiness School."

⁸⁵ Israel Knohl, "The Priestly Torah versus the Holiness School: Ideological Aspects," in *Proceedings of the Tenth World Congress of Jewish Studies: Jerusalem, August 16-24, 1989. Vol. 1* (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1990), 52.

⁸⁶ Knohl, "Priestly Torah," 57.

⁸⁷ Knohl, "Priestly Torah," 57.

⁸⁸ Knohl, "Priestly Torah," 56.

⁸⁹ Knohl, "Priestly Torah," 56.

⁹⁰ Knohl, "Priestly Torah," 52.

⁹¹ Knohl, "Priestly Torah," 56.

⁹² Knohl, "Priestly Torah," 57.

⁹³ Knohl, "Priestly Torah," 51, 57.

Knohl's classification on the Priestly nature of Num 20:1-13 is based on his uncommon view on the Priestly writings. For Knohl, the Priestly Torah is a purer Priestly cultic conception, while the Holiness School displays a Priestly-popular orientation.⁹⁵ Besides, "the affinity to the language of non-Priestly sources is one of the hallmarks of the Holiness School."⁹⁶ Most of the Priestly materials in the book of Numbers, according to Knohl, were products of the Holiness School.⁹⁷ Only Num 5:11-31; 6:1-21; 19 and 28-29 were from the Priestly Torah, but they were all adapted and edited by the Holiness School.⁹⁸ According to Knohl, Num 20:1-13 was of JE origin and edited by the Holiness School.⁹⁹

Knohl considers Deut 32:51 as a repetition of Num 27:12-13, and they were also products of the Holiness School.¹⁰⁰ He accepts the idea from Noth that this repetition became necessary after the book of Deuteronomy was appended to the Genesis-Numbers corpus.¹⁰¹ He suggests that the Deuteronomistic School had written and edited the book of Deuteronomy, and the Holiness School was

⁹⁴ Knohl, "Priestly Torah," 51.

⁹⁵ Knohl, *Sanctuary*, 44.

⁹⁶ Knohl, *Sanctuary*, 82.

⁹⁷ Knohl, *Sanctuary*, 100.

⁹⁸ Knohl, *Sanctuary*, 104.

⁹⁹ Knohl, *Sanctuary*, 105.

¹⁰⁰ Knohl, *Sanctuary*, 95, 105-106. He thinks that the proof of the origin of the Holiness School in the final editorial stratum can be seen in Num 20:12. There is a direct address by God to Moses and Aaron in which God spoke in the first person. This "direct address by God to Moses and Aaron" is a characteristic of the Holiness School. The other four passages (Lev 14:33-34; Lev 15:31; Num 14:26-27 and Num 16:20-21), in which the first person pronoun appears in the divine speech to Moses and Aaron, all belong to the editorial stratum of the Holiness School. But in the Priestly Torah, the first person pronoun is used in the divine speech exclusively when divine words are addressed to Moses alone. See Knohl, *Sanctuary*, 94-95.

¹⁰¹ Knohl, *Sanctuary*, 95.

apparently responsible for attaching the book of Deuteronomy to the Tetrateuch.¹⁰²

He further states that in the beginning of the Persian period, the Holiness School

concluded its activities with the final redaction of the Pentateuch.¹⁰³ Thus, for Knohl,

Num 20:1-13; 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52 are all products of the Holiness

School.¹⁰⁴ The editors of the Holiness School often incorporated JE elements into

Priestly language. That is why there is a mixture of styles.¹⁰⁵

There is no lack of divergent views. For instance, Baruch Levine says that

Num 20 was redacted by the Priestly School, and the JE material of Num 20:1-13 has

been reworked by the Priestly writers.¹⁰⁶ According to Levine, Num 27:12-14 is a

Priestly account.¹⁰⁷ He mentions that Deut 32:49 is “assigned to the Priestly

source”¹⁰⁸ without any reference to Perlitt’s study. Other scholars such as Davies,

¹⁰² Knohl, *Sanctuary*, 103.

¹⁰³ Knohl, *Sanctuary*, 226.

¹⁰⁴ Jacob Milgrom agrees with Knohl that there must be a clear distinction between the Priestly Torah and the Holiness School. For instance, he states that H introduces three radical changes regarding P’s notion of holiness. However, he has some reservations about Knohl’s classification on the amount of passages edited by the Holiness School in the book of Numbers. Milgrom states that it is certain Num 3:11-13; 8:15b-19; 15:1-41 are from the Holiness School. Other texts which probably should be assigned to the Holiness School are Num 3:40-51; 5:1-3; 9:9-14; 10:10; 19:10b-13; 28:2b; 29:39; 33:50-56 and 35-36. Milgrom criticises that the remaining passages (including Num 20:1-13; 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52) in Knohl’s list might be from the Holiness School, but there is insufficient evidence. Although Milgrom has written the article “Priestly (“P”) Source” in the *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, he himself doubts the existence of a discrete literary source for the Priestly writings in a commentary of the book of Numbers. He uses the term “Priestly” only when focusing on matters of style and ideology. He admits that he has no reasonable assurance that his identification of any Priestly narrative is correct. But he states that Num 20: 6 belongs to P, and Num 20:9 is one of the Priestly texts. See Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 3A; New York: Doubleday, 2000), 1325-1330, 1334, 1343-44, 1850; idem, “The Changing Concept of Holiness in the Pentateuchal Codes with Emphasis on Leviticus 19,” in *Reading Leviticus: A Conversation with Mary Douglas* (ed. John F. A. Sawyer; JSOTSup 227; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 67; idem, “Priestly (“P”) Source,” *ABD* 5: 454-461; idem, *Numbers* (JPSTC; Philadelphia, PA.: JPS, 1989), xix; idem, *Leviticus 1-16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 3; New York: Doubleday, 1991), 140, 589.

¹⁰⁵ Knohl, *Sanctuary*, 95.

¹⁰⁶ Levine, *Numbers 1-20*, 483-4.

¹⁰⁷ Levine, *Numbers 21-36*, 352, 353.

¹⁰⁸ Levine, *Numbers 21-36*, 348.

Frankel, Knierim and Coats, Schmidt, Seebass and Ska also keep the traditional view and consider most of Num 20:1-13 and Num 27:12-14 to be products of the Priestly School.¹⁰⁹

From the above discussion of the various approaches to the formation of the Pentateuch, we can find that there are great differences in the scale among the approaches. Knohl takes the Holiness School as the redactor of the Pentateuch; Römer suggests the bridging of the Triteuch with Deuteronomy; Otto's proposes the redactions of Hexateuch and the Pentateuch; the model of Kratz is in the largest scale that it involves the formation of the Enneateuch by redactional expansion. Although the scales are different, they all agree that Num 20:1-13; 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52 are post-Priestly. This brings out a point that "post-Priestly" is just a diachronic term clarifying that it is later than the Priestly writing. "Post-Priestly" is not necessarily anti-Priestly. One of the contributions of Perlitt's article is that it shows the possibility that the scribal school in the post-exilic period would blend the phraseology and style of the Deuteronomic School with that of the Priestly School. Thus, the later redactor was influenced by different schools of traditions and theologies. Although we may be able to exclude the possibility that the redactor of Deut 32:48-52 (and Num 20:1-13; 27:12-14) was from the Priestly School, we

¹⁰⁹ Eryl W. Davies, *Numbers* (NCBC; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1995), 201-2; Daivid Frankel, *The Murmuring Stories of the Priestly School: A Retrieval of Ancient Sacerdotal Lore* (VTSup 89; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 143, 263, 281; Rolf P. Knierim and George W. Coats, *Numbers* (FOTL 4; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005), 228; Ludwig von Schmidt, *Studien zur Priesterschrift* (BZAW 214; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993), 54, 211; Horst Seebass, *Numeri. III, Numeri Kapitel 22,2-36,13* (BKAT 4/3; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2007), 222; Horst Seebass, *Numeri. I, Numeri Kapitel 1,1-10,10* (BKAT 4/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2012), 34*; Jean-Louis Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch* (trans. P. Dominique; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 150.

cannot exclude that there are Priestly elements in this passage. The final redactor, who was not from the Priestly School in the strict sense, would have been affected by the theology of the Priestly School and the Holiness School. Blending the language and theologies of different schools, the later redactor produced a new tradition which could speak to his situation.

(3) Summary

Vocabulary, style and theology cannot be used as the criteria for the evidence for the Priestly nature of Num 20:1-13; 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52. There is a mixture of Priestly and non-Priestly language in these three texts. The blending of P and non-P language in these three passages can be understood as signs of “post-Priestly” additions during the formation of the Pentateuch. We have selectively reviewed the current scholarship on the formation of the Pentateuch with an eye on the Priestly and non-Priestly nature of Num 20:1-13; 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52. There is a tendency that the Pentateuch texts can be classified to “pre-Priestly,” “Priestly,” and “post-Priestly.” The models of Kratz, Otto, Römer and Knohl all perceive the three texts (Num 20:1-13; 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52) as post-Priestly, and as the result of supplements. But post-Priestly does not necessarily mean anti-Priestly. It is possible that the later scribal school has inherited the theologies of the Priestly School and the Deuteronomic School during the last stage(s) of the formation of the Pentateuch.

2. Review of previous studies on divine anger in Deuteronomy

There is no study of the topic of divine anger that solely focuses on the book of Deuteronomy. Most of the older dictionary articles and essays discuss the idea or theology of divine anger/ wrath in the whole Hebrew Bible, and seldom concentrate only on the passages of Deuteronomy. They prefer to give a synthesis of the concept of divine anger from the whole Hebrew Bible.¹¹⁰ Some of them devote part of the work into the discussion of divine anger in Deuteronomy or the Deuteronomistic History. The following studies are selected because they give contributions to the understanding of divine anger in Deuteronomy. It will be suggested that there are at least four approaches to the issue of divine anger.¹¹¹

¹¹⁰ The following summaries of some articles and essays can illustrate this common method. For instance, J. Orr says that anger is an energy of the divine nature called forth by the presence of daring or presumptuous transgression, and expressing the reaction of the divine holiness against it in the punishment or destruction of the transgressor. Divine anger has thus always an ethical connotation, and manifests itself to ends of righteousness and mercy. Such anger should not be weakened down into a mere “anthropomorphism” or “general expression for God’s aversion to sin,” but should be regarded as a real affection of divine nature. See J. Orr, “Anger (Wrath) of God,” *DBH* 1: 97-99; T. B. Kilpatrick states that the nature of divine anger is always to be understood by reference to the central truth of YHWH’s self-revelation that YHWH is a covenant God of His people. When the salvation of His people is infringed, He will be angry. Divine anger is manifested in judgments following upon wicked deeds. The wrath of God can be turned away as it is controlled by divine love (the ultimate divine purpose). See T. B. Kilpatrick, “Anger (Wrath) of God,” in *ERE* 1: 477-482; B. T. Dahlberg defines anger as: “The biblical conception of the Deity’s threatening with annihilation the existence of whatever opposes his will and purpose or violates his holiness and love.” He then discusses on “Irrational wrath,” “Wrath and Sin,” “Instruments of the divine wrath,” “The day of Wrath,” “Salvation from the wrath of God,” “The wrath of God and his love.” According to Dahlberg, in the Hebrew Bible the wrath of God may be provoked against Israel, individuals or groups within Israel, nations and their rulers, and mankind in general. See B. T. Dahlberg, “Wrath of God,” *IDB* 4:903-906.

¹¹¹ The boundaries between different approaches are fluid. Some scholars may apply two or three approaches together. The classification of the approaches is just for the sake of clarity.

(1) Thematic approach

There is a section discussing the theology of divine anger in Deuteronomy in Albrecht Ritschl's massive work *Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung* (The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation).¹¹² In that section, Ritschl points out that the wrath of God is caused by the problems of the Israelites, such problems include their falling from the covenant, and their actions which may be regarded as a breach of covenant.¹¹³ When the Israelites worship foreign gods or make political union with foreign nations, they contradict the theocratic destiny of the covenant people.¹¹⁴ The Israelites who violated the covenant would be utterly destroyed.¹¹⁵ Ritschl concludes that the original concept of divine wrath is connected with the experience of sudden and surprising death in the case of those who have broken the conditions of the covenant.¹¹⁶

Ritschl's treatment on the covenant theme to divine anger is influential, even some current scholars use this similar idea to explain the occurrence of divine wrath.¹¹⁷ Although this approach can give a big picture for the theme, there are two

¹¹² Albrecht Ritschl, *Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung, Vol. II* (3d ed.; Bonn: Adolph Marcus, 1889) (1st ed.: 1874). Although this book is very old, it is also influential, as we shall see, some recent scholars still repeat ideas similar to Ritschl's conclusion.

¹¹³ Ritschl, *Rechtfertigung II*, 127.

¹¹⁴ Ritschl, *Rechtfertigung II*, 127.

¹¹⁵ Ritschl, *Rechtfertigung II*, 124-125.

¹¹⁶ Ritschl, *Rechtfertigung II*, 129.

¹¹⁷ For instance, Herbert Haney also points out the tight connection between the wrath of God and the covenant. According to Haney, the wrath of God was provoked because the covenant was either "abrogated or abhorred." Wrath fell upon the Israelites because they broke the covenant, and wrath fell upon "enemy nations" because they abhorred the covenant. See Herbert M. Haney, *Wrath of God in the Former Prophets*, (New York: Vantage Press, 1960), 17. Victor Matthews says that the Israelites were in a "treaty or covenant" relationship with YHWH. This relationship placed obligations on both parties and also stipulated specific penalties because of failure to abide by the terms of the treaty. The phrase "the anger of YHWH" occurs as a theological explanation for YHWH's justified

limitations of such approach. Firstly, when the emphasis is on the process of synthesis and the common point of the passages, it may overlook the nuances among the passages. Secondly, the synthesised theme may be a product of generalisation and gross oversimplification. The theme may not be true to the *context* of the biblical texts. For instance, Ritschl has not dealt with most of the text in Deuteronomy. Part of his observations and conclusions are from his selection of Deut 4:24; 6:15; 9:8, 14, 19; 11:17; 29:27. Therefore his conclusion cannot be applied in all the passages with divine anger in Deuteronomy, and does not directly relate to the texts of our present study. In Deut 1:34 the wrath of God is not a result of the breaking of the covenant. According to the context of Deut 1:19-40, the main problem of the Israelites is their lack of faith, not their breach of the covenant. The Israelites suspected that YHWH hated them and wanted to destroy them by the hand of the Amorites. They did not believe that God would fight for them (Deut 1:32-33). In this case, they did not break a covenant. In addition, in Deut 1:37; 4:21 the anger of YHWH on Moses is also not caused by any action which can be claimed as breaking of the covenant. Thus,

response based on the Israelites' violation of the covenant. See Victor H. Matthew, *Judges and Ruth* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 50-51. In the last chapter of Deena Grant's monograph, which attempts to deal with divine anger in the whole Hebrew Bible, it also states that divine anger arises over the Israelites' breach of the covenant God made with the patriarchs and renewed with the subsequent generations. The wrath of God is also tempered by this covenant. The promise of tempered anger functions rhetorically to urge Israel to turn toward their covenant partner. See Deena E. Grant, *Divine Anger in the Hebrew Bible* (CBQMS 52; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2014), 165-66. However, the section of "Angers at Individuals in Deuteronomy and the Historical Books" in her monograph is very short, just has two paragraphs across two pages, discussing Deut 29:18-19; Achan (Joshua), Jerobam (1Kgs 14:9), and Basha (1 Kgs 16:2) only. Although Grant's monograph is the most current treatment on the issue of divine anger, her study on the book of Deuteronomy is highly selective. The wrath of God on Moses is never mentioned in her book, and her main observations and conclusions cannot be applied on Deut 1:37; 3:26 and 4:21 for our present study.

Ritschl's comment on the divine wrath in the historical books, although including Deuteronomy, cannot explain the relation between the exclusion of Moses and the anger of God.

(2) Word study approach

In the third part of his *TDNT* article, Johannes Fichtner discusses six topics about divine wrath in the Hebrew Bible.¹¹⁸ The first is a word study of the expressions of divine anger. Second, Fichtner shows that the two main objects of divine anger include the Israelites and the nations.¹¹⁹ Third, he clarifies that sickness, persecution, the threat of premature death and other disasters are all signs of wrath.¹²⁰ Fourth, Fichtner talks about the innermost nature of divine wrath, irrational/ incomprehensible, and examples of texts pointing out that divine anger is a reaction to human failure.¹²¹ In the Pentateuch, divine wrath smites the people when they rebel against His will;¹²² while in the Deuteronomistic History, the apostasy of the Israelites is the recurring reason for divine wrath against the Israelites.¹²³ Fifth, Fichtner introduces the outbreak, duration and turning aside of divine wrath.¹²⁴ Sixth and finally, the relationships between divine wrath and divine holiness, divine

¹¹⁸ Johannes Fichtner, "The Wrath of Men and the Wrath of God in the Old Testament," in *TDNT* 5: 393-409. English edition: 1967; German edition: 1954.

¹¹⁹ Fichtner, *TDNT* 5:398-399.

¹²⁰ Fichtner, *TDNT* 5:399-401.

¹²¹ Fichtner, *TDNT* 5:402.

¹²² Fichtner, *TDNT* 5:402.

¹²³ Fichtner, *TDNT* 5:403.

¹²⁴ Fichtner, *TDNT* 5:404-407.

righteousness and divine mercy are discussed.¹²⁵

One of Fichtner's contributions is that he approaches the issue by paying attention to the usage of specific words for divine anger. Such linguistic information provides the basic ground for the discussion of that issue. He points out that some words, such as *חרון אף* or *חרון*, *זעם* and *קצף* are used in the Hebrew Bible exclusively for divine wrath.¹²⁶ There are some combinations of terms used only to denote the wrath of God, such as *חרון אף*, *זעף אף*, *זעם אף* and *עברות אף*.¹²⁷

In addition, he argues that when the nouns for anger link with the name YHWH, such as *אף יהוה*, *חמה יהוה*, *עברה יהוה* and *קצף יהוה*, this connection is of supreme theological significance because the name *יהוה* is a name of the covenant God. Such consistent linkage shows that the idea of anger is closely bound up with faith in the covenant.¹²⁸ This claim is well accepted by other scholars, for example, Dahlberg also states that when a term for wrath is connected with a name for the Deity in the Hebrew Bible, the divine name is almost always that of YHWH, the covenant God.¹²⁹

However, one may doubt whether Fichtner's above claim is justified for he says that divine wrath is connected to the covenant by the using of the name YHWH. We propose the *context* of the passage is more important than the connection with the divine name. There are examples that breaking of the covenant is related to divine

¹²⁵ Fichtner, *TDNT* 5:407-409.

¹²⁶ Fichtner, *TDNT* 5:395-396.

¹²⁷ Fichtner, *TDNT* 5:396.

¹²⁸ Fichtner, *TDNT* 5:396.

¹²⁹ B. T. Dahlberg, "Wrath of God," *IDB* 4:903-906.

anger although the nouns for anger are not linked with the name YHWH. In Deut 29:23-24, the noun אַף is not combined with the name YHWH, but the context itself shows that divine wrath is caused by the abandonment of the covenant. Therefore the context of the passage is the primary factor to govern the connection between divine wrath with the covenant.

Besides, some of Fichtner's statements have the problem of "generalization." He states that divine wrath smites the one who has rebelled against His will,¹³⁰ and the Israelites' apostasy is the recurring reason for divine wrath against His people.¹³¹ This conclusion is too general to be applied to some texts in Deuteronomy. In the spy story Moses is neither said to rebelling against God's will nor accused of any apostasy. Therefore, Fichtner's treatment cannot solve our question of the relation of divine anger and the exclusion of Moses.

(3) The approach in the framework of the Deuteronomistic History

Many scholars have recognised that the theme of divine anger occupies an important position in the Deuteronomistic History. For instance, Ralph Klein states that the Deuteronomistic historian asks why YHWH has destroyed His land.¹³² The Deuteronomistic historian himself answers that it is because the people had served other gods, and forsaken the covenant of YHWH. The result of these transgressions

¹³⁰ Fichtner, *TDNT* 5:402.

¹³¹ Fichtner, *TDNT* 5:403.

¹³² Ralph W. Klein, *Israel in Exile: A Theological Interpretation* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 25.

is an outbreak of divine anger.¹³³ Similarly, Rudolf Smend points out that the Deuteronomistic writings display a scheme of judgment in which God directs his wrath against the Israelites because of their disobedience and idolatry, by which they provoked YHWH to anger.¹³⁴ Furthermore, Thomas Römer indicates that the whole Deuteronomistic History maintains the assertion that the end of the monarchy, the destruction of Jerusalem and the loss of the land result from YHWH's anger.¹³⁵ Moreover, Reinhard Achenbach also considers the motif of YHWH's wrath becomes the key to understand Israel's demise when the Deuteronomic/ Deuteronomistic covenant theology is under the influence of the Assyrian/ Babylonian oaths of vassality.¹³⁶

Anthony Hanson may be one of the pioneers who have observed the importance of the theme of divine anger in the framework of the Deuteronomistic History. He observes that divine wrath is not very prominent in JE or P, but occurs very frequently in Deuteronomy and the "Deuteronomic parts of the Pentateuch."¹³⁷ Hanson believes that a moral principle in history is needed in the time of the Deuteronomist.¹³⁸ In Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic work, divine wrath is increasingly moralized and rationalized, and approximates to the personal reaction of YHWH to special flagrant sins, idolatry in particular.¹³⁹ The Deuteronomic School

¹³³ Klein, *Israel*, 25.

¹³⁴ Rudolf Smend, "Wrath of God (OT)," *EncChr* 5: 811.

¹³⁵ Römer, *So-Called*, 116.

¹³⁶ Reinhard Achenbach, "Wrath of God (Old Testament)," *RPP* Brill Online, 2013.

¹³⁷ Anthony T. Hanson, *The Wrath of The Lamb* (London: SPCK, 1957), 39.

¹³⁸ Hanson, *Wrath*, 39.

¹³⁹ Hanson, *Wrath*, 37.

depicts the wrath as a working principle in history.¹⁴⁰ Hanson's observation on the high occurrence of divine anger in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History has set a base for further study.

Jörg Jeremias states that the anger of God plays a vital role in the Deuteronomistic History.¹⁴¹ The anger of God was caused by the grave sin of Israel.¹⁴² The Deuteronomistic theologians tried to understand the destruction of Samaria and Jerusalem from the knowledge of God's wrath and the awareness of the severe sin of the people.¹⁴³ Jeremias observes two characteristics of the Deuteronomistic History. First, God's wrath is not mentioned in the older "source texts"¹⁴⁴ but in the "interpretive Deuteronomistic texts." Divine anger is an element of interpretation of history from the exodus to the fall of the kingdom in relation to the destruction of Jerusalem.¹⁴⁵ Second, the Deuteronomistic theologians use different words of divine anger to distinguish different types and concepts of divine wrath in four different periods of Israel's history.¹⁴⁶

In the period of Moses, Jeremias concentrates only on the text of the golden calf (Deut 9-10), but not the text of the spy story or the exclusion of Moses. Jeremias points out that the Deuteronomistic work would like to present that the Israelites

¹⁴⁰ Hanson, *Wrath*, 37.

¹⁴¹ J. Jeremias, *Der Zorn Gottes im Alten Testament: Das biblische Israel zwischen Verwerfung und Erwählung* (2d ed.; BTS 104; Göttingen: Neukirchener, 2011), 46.

¹⁴² Jeremias, *Zorn Gottes*, 46.

¹⁴³ Jeremias, *Zorn Gottes*, 46.

¹⁴⁴ Eg.: 2 Sam 9-20; 1 Kgs 1-2; 17-19; 2 Kgs 1-8.

¹⁴⁵ Jeremias, *Zorn Gottes*, 53.

¹⁴⁶ The period of Moses; the period of Joshua and the judges; the period of the Northern Kingdom (Israel); the period of the Southern Kingdom (Judah). See Jeremias, *Zorn Gottes*, 54.

deserved God's wrath because they had sinned in the beginning of their history.¹⁴⁷

In Deut 9-10, the Israelites provoked God to anger. They also provoked God before the destruction of Samaria and Jerusalem.¹⁴⁸ The story of the golden calf is connected with the sins of the divided kingdoms by using of the verbs כָּעַס ("to provoke... to anger") and אָנַף ("to be angry"), and similar wordings such as "since the day they/ their fathers came out of Egypt" (Deut 9:7; 2 Kgs 21:15).¹⁴⁹

The Israelites, according to Jeremias, deserved to be destroyed because of their accumulative sins from the period of exodus to the period of the divided kingdoms. However, they were neither destroyed in the incident of the golden calf nor the fall of Samaria and Jerusalem.¹⁵⁰ In Deut 9-10, the Israelites were saved by the intercession of Moses. During the fall of Samaria and Jerusalem, the people were deported into exile.¹⁵¹

Although the text in Deut 1-4 is not the focus of Jeremias' book, and his treatment does not directly contribute to our investigation of divine wrath on Moses, his study is still useful for it shows that some passages in the book of Deuteronomy can be understood in the Deuteronomistic History.

Kari Latvus attempts to identify the redaction activities that handle divine anger in D, P, book of Joshua and Judges.¹⁵² Latvus claims that in the original short

¹⁴⁷ Jeremias, *Zorn Gottes*, 68.

¹⁴⁸ Jeremias, *Zorn Gottes*, 69.

¹⁴⁹ Jeremias, *Zorn Gottes*, 71-72.

¹⁵⁰ Jeremias, *Zorn Gottes*, 73.

¹⁵¹ Jeremias, *Zorn Gottes*, 73.

¹⁵² Kari Latvus, *God, Anger and Ideology: The Anger of God in Joshua and Judges in relation to Deuteronomy and the Priestly Writings* (JSOTSup 279; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998),

history of the Deuteronomists, YHWH's anger is not a theme because there are only two passages (Deut 1:27, 34). This theme, according to Latvus, was introduced by the redactors of DtrN-group¹⁵³ after the Deuteronomistic History was expanded and mentioned the anger theme.¹⁵⁴ The DtrN historians rationalised the meaning of exile and interpreted that it was caused by divine wrath which in turn was caused by idolatry of the Israelites.¹⁵⁵ In such claims, the Deuteronomistic historians understood that the Israelites were responsible for the guilt of national and historical events. The wrong religious attitudes and behavior of the Israelites were the reason for exile.¹⁵⁶ The theology of anger is deeply bound to experiences of national catastrophes and crises, and ought to be evaluated only in that context.¹⁵⁷ The values of the past are interpreted in the light of historical events and experiences.¹⁵⁸

Latvus' study is worthy of note on the issue of the redaction of DtrN. For our present study, however, one point should be assessed. On the one hand, Latvus claims that the anger theme did not belong to the pre-exilic Deuteronomic law code, but was really a (late-) Deuteronomistic invention.¹⁵⁹ On the other hand, he also notices the two passages (Deut 1:27 and 1:34) come from the basic text of the Deuteronomistic historian.¹⁶⁰ It seems that Latvus contradicts himself. If divine

26.

¹⁵³ DtrN = the nomistic layer, which is formed during the exile, has an interest in law and emphasises the role of Moses as interpreter of the law.

¹⁵⁴ Latvus, *Ideology*, 71.

¹⁵⁵ Latvus, *Ideology*, 87.

¹⁵⁶ Latvus, *Ideology*, 87.

¹⁵⁷ Latvus, *Ideology*, 86.

¹⁵⁸ Latvus, *Ideology*, 86-87.

¹⁵⁹ Latvus, *Ideology*, 73.

¹⁶⁰ Latvus, *Ideology*, 71.

anger has been already mentioned in the older layer of Deuteronomy, then it would not be an invention.

In her study, Samantha Joo traces the development of the usage of the Hiphil of the verb כָּעַס in the Deuteronomistic History and Book of Jeremiah. She claims that this verb is a vital theological term in the Deuteronomistic History and the book of Jeremiah.¹⁶¹ Joo adopts the “two level theory” of the Deuteronomistic History. She agrees that at least two layers of editorial work can be detected in the Deuteronomistic History.¹⁶² The “first redaction level” of the Deuteronomistic History (DtrH1) compiled a continuous narrative from a pool of stories or an earlier prophetic source during the period of Josiah, while the “second redaction level” of the Deuteronomistic History (DtrH2) modified these stories to explain the fall of Jerusalem and Samaria.¹⁶³

In DtrH1 the Hiphil of the verb כָּעַס functions as a pivot,¹⁶⁴ heralding the punishment in the curse formulae against the first three dynasties¹⁶⁵ and in the narrative recounting their fulfillment.¹⁶⁶ There is no explicit claim that YHWH is the initiator of the calamities. Human and natural instruments fulfill God’s pronouncement against the dynasties.¹⁶⁷

¹⁶¹ Samantha Joo, *Provocation and Punishment: The Anger of God in the Book of Jeremiah and Deuteronomistic Theology* (BZAW 361; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006).

¹⁶² Joo, *Provocation*, 26.

¹⁶³ Joo, *Provocation*, 26.

¹⁶⁴ For Joo, the first redaction level of Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History includes: Deut 32:15-25; 1 Kgs 14:7-11; 15:29-30; 16:2-4, 11-13, 25-26, 30-33; 21:20b-26, 53-54. See Joo, *Provocation*, 8.

¹⁶⁵ Jeroboam, Baasha and Omri.

¹⁶⁶ Joo, *Provocation*, 64.

¹⁶⁷ Joo, *Provocation*, 226.

DtrH2 adopts the term **הכעיס** to explain the fall of Jerusalem.¹⁶⁸ In these post-exilic levels of the Deuteronomistic History, **הכעיס** usually links the catalog of sins to the punishment.¹⁶⁹ Contrary to DtrH1, God is usually the primary agent of the punishment.¹⁷⁰ God's involvement is more explicit than the descriptions of the punishment in DtrH1.¹⁷¹ YHWH is depicted as the initiator of the calamities and the people should bear the responsibility for the exile.¹⁷² The crisis arising from the destruction of Jerusalem in 587 BCE and the deportations of its people to Babylon is the factor which would prompt DtrH2 to reconfigure the method in which DtrH1 explained the historical events.¹⁷³

The entry point of Joo is the passages that contain the Hiphil of **כעס**. Not all of Joo's conclusion may give direct contribution to our present study because the verb **כעס** does not occur in the three passage containing divine anger on Moses (Deut 1:37; 3:26 and 4:21). However, Deut 4:25, which is also in the same context as Deut 4:21, does contain the verb **כעס**. According to Joo, Deut 4:25 is redacted by DtrH2 who depicts that God is the primary agent of destruction to the Israelites for their apostasy. This conclusion will be contributed to our discussion in Chapter Six when we deal with Deut 4.

Two others scholars, Dennis McCarthy and Norbert Lohfink, have clearly

¹⁶⁸ For Joo, the second redaction level of Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History includes: Deut 4:25-28; 9:18-20; 31:27-29; Judg 2:11-16; 1 Kgs 14:15-16a; 16:7; 2 Kgs 17:7-23a; 21:2-15; 22:15-17; 23:19-20; 23:26-27. See Joo, *Provocation*, 8.

¹⁶⁹ Joo, *Provocation*, 115.

¹⁷⁰ Joo, *Provocation*, 115-226.

¹⁷¹ Joo, *Provocation*, 226.

¹⁷² Joo, *Provocation*, 226.

¹⁷³ Joo, *Provocation*, 228.

expounded how the theme of divine anger works with the structure and theology of the Deuteronomistic work. McCarthy suggests that there are two formulae on the wrath of YHWH in the Deuteronomistic History.¹⁷⁴ First, the “anger formula” which uses the phrase “the anger of YHWH blazes” or “YHWH is angry” is tied to the announcement of penalty. Second, the “provocation formula,” using the phrase “one provokes YHWH to anger,” is not closely tied to a divine judgment announcing a penalty. The two wrath formulae work in the well-knit structure in the Deuteronomistic History, from Deuteronomy to the book of Kings. Lohfink suggests that there is an “exile formula” which has not been noticed.¹⁷⁵ He classifies McCarthy’s “anger formula” and “provocation formula” into one group rather than two because both of them will result in destruction. Lohfink’s study concentrates on the texts of Deut 28-29 and 2 Kgs 17:21-25, and he finds that the “exile formula” was a re-interpretation of the Deuteronomists who wanted to give hope to the people who were deported into exile, but not destroyed. The studies of McCarthy and Lohfink will be assessed in more detail in Chapter Five of this dissertation.

(4) The approach with ancient Near Eastern parallels

The theme of divine anger in the Hebrew Bible can be understood by comparing

¹⁷⁴ Dennis J. McCarthy, “The Wrath of Yahweh and the Structural Unity of the Deuteronomistic History,” in *Essays in Old Testament* (ed. James L. Crenshaw et al.; New York: KTAV Publ. House, 1974), 98-110.

¹⁷⁵ Norbert Lohfink, “Der Zorn Gottes und das Exil. Beobachtungen am deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk,” in *Liebe und Gebot: FS L. Perlitt* (ed. R. G. Kratz et al.; FRLANT 190; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 137-155; repr. of idem, *Studien zum Deuteronomium und zur deuteronomistischen Literatur V* (SBAB 38; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2005), 37-55.

it with the ancient Near Eastern texts. Since the Hebrew Bible is a product of the Israelites who were surrounded by the ancient Near Eastern culture, such culture may influence the authors and redactors' way of thinking.¹⁷⁶ Betril Albrektson is one of the scholars who observe the similarity in depicting divine anger between the ancient Near Eastern texts and the Hebrew Bible.¹⁷⁷ Albrektson maintains that the historical events are interpreted as divine punishment of disobedient princes who incur divine wrath. Albrektson notices that a Mesopotamian deity cannot simply be explained as a personification of a certain phenomenon of nature, but is regarded as a personal will which could influence historical events.¹⁷⁸ Thus an author of an ancient Near Eastern text explains that the destruction of Babylonia is because of a god's anger.¹⁷⁹ Hence, Albrektson's study has stressed on the similarities between the idea of divine anger of the Hebrew Bible and that of the ancient Near Eastern culture.

Gray Herion's article also emphasises that the wrath of YHWH in the Hebrew Bible should be understood with the comparison of the many portrayals of divine anger found in numerous ancient Near Eastern texts.¹⁸⁰ Herion distinguishes two types of ancient Near Eastern texts in depicting the anger of gods. In the first type the anger of a certain deity is portrayed as an idiosyncratic aspect of that god's

¹⁷⁶ For more study, John C. Gibson, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions Vol. 1: Hebrew and Moabite inscriptions* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1971), 74-76; James A. Montgomery, *The Books of Kings* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1951), 235-236; For recent studies, see Eds. R. G. Kratz and H. Spieckermann, *Divine Wrath and Divine Mercy in the World of Antiquity* (FAT 2/33; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008).

¹⁷⁷ Betril Albrektson, *History and Gods* (Lund: Gleerup, 1967), 100-103. He discusses the Mesha stone, the curse of Akkad, the Era Epic and the Weidner Chronicle.

¹⁷⁸ Albrektson, *History*, 32.

¹⁷⁹ Albrektson, *History*, 32.

¹⁸⁰ Gray Herion, "Wrath of God," *ABD* 6:989-996.

personality.¹⁸¹ Herion clarifies that this ancient Near Eastern picture of the wrath of gods is very different from that of YHWH in the Hebrew Bible, in which YHWH has a desire to restrain His own anger.¹⁸²

The second type can be further divided into two sub-groups.¹⁸³ In the first sub-group, the historical devastation of a particular city is attributed to a deity who becomes angry because of some cultic sacrilege.¹⁸⁴ In the second sub-group, a historical catastrophe is attributed to a god who becomes angry because the political leaders (or the people) break certain solemn oaths which they have sworn to keep.¹⁸⁵ In both sub-groups, a god's legitimate and official wrath is provoked because of human transgressions. Herion points out that the angry YHWH in the Hebrew Bible is similar to the second type divine wrath in the ancient Near Eastern texts. YHWH would be angry with the Israelites when they violated the covenant obligations.¹⁸⁶ The anger of YHWH is not driven by His personal feeling but by His official duty. However, there is a great difference between these ancient Near Eastern depictions of divine wrath and that of YHWH. The ancient Near Eastern texts are written by kings who seek to legitimate their policies. The Hebrew Bible lacks such ideological function.

Furthermore, Herion compares the "Royal" (human) wrath in ancient Near

¹⁸¹ Herion, "Wrath," 6:991.

¹⁸² Herion lists out eight examples from the ancient Near Eastern texts which depict that the gods or goddess would become angry for no good reason. Some deities cannot control their irrational anger, and must be restrained by the intervention of other deities. See Herion, "Wrath," 6:991-92.

¹⁸³ Herion, "Wrath," 6:992-93.

¹⁸⁴ Herion, "Wrath," 6:992.

¹⁸⁵ Herion, "Wrath," 6:992-93.

¹⁸⁶ Herion, "Wrath," 6:993.

Eastern texts with YHWH's wrath.¹⁸⁷ He explains that the function of depicting the wrath of Kings is not to humanize the kings but to aggrandize the king.¹⁸⁸ According to Herion, when YHWH becomes angry with the Israelites for their violation of covenant, YHWH is portrayed as the "King" of Israel. Also when YHWH is angry with the mythological creatures, He is portrayed as having the sovereignty. Thus, Herion concludes that the anger of YHWH is not used to humanize YHWH, but to exalt Him.¹⁸⁹ Thus, Herion's comparison gives us both the similarities and differences between the Hebrew Bible and the ancient Near Eastern texts.

Jörg Jeremias, however, stresses the difference between the Hebrew Bible and the ancient Near Eastern parallels. He compares how divine anger is used in the ancient Near East texts and in the Deuteronomistic work. He found that they portray divine anger in different ways. The ancient Near Eastern texts were written *after the time of distress* had passed, and they tended to emphasize the good deeds of the new king who brought about the "turning point" of the divine wrath.¹⁹⁰ In contrast, the Deuteronomistic History was written *in times of distress*, and it attempted to find out the reasons for God's wrath.¹⁹¹

The authors of the Hebrew Bible may agree with their surrounding culture and use similar idea to express their theology of the anger of God. On the contrary, they may also disagree with the surroundings and produce their own view on divine wrath.

¹⁸⁷ Herion, "Wrath," 994-95.

¹⁸⁸ Herion, "Wrath," 995.

¹⁸⁹ Herion, "Wrath," 995.

¹⁹⁰ Jeremias, *Zorn Gottes*, 53.

¹⁹¹ Jeremias, *Zorn Gottes*, 53.

The studies of Herion and Jeremias stress that there are also great differences in depicting divine wrath between the ancient Near Eastern texts and the Hebrew Bible. For our present, however, the parallel texts with divine anger are not enough because we need to compare with the punishments which were caused by divine anger. So far, there is no parallel in ancient Near Eastern literature for a leader being forbade from entering a land by his deity, just like the punishment of Moses. Therefore, this type of approach cannot be used for our present study at this moment.

(5) Summary

To summarise, there are three points to note. In the first place, an accurate description of the theme of divine wrath should include a precise study on the words used for the anger of God (Fichtner, McCarthy, Lohfink, Joo and Jeremias). For instance, Fichtner observes the details in the verb usage and word pairings; McCarthy differentiates the different words used in the “anger formula” and “provocation formula” in the Deuteronomistic History; Joo distinguishes the different usages of the Hiphil of the verb כָּעַס in different layers of the Deuteronomistic work.

Second, the meaning of divine anger in a particular passage should be *primarily* understood in its own context (McCarthy, Lohfink, Joo and Jeremias). The word study mentioned in the previous point cannot replace an exegesis of a passage in its own context because the meaning of a word can be determined primarily according

to its context. A word in different contexts will give varied meaning.

Third, the theme of divine anger in Deuteronomy can be studied under the framework of the Deuteronomistic History (Jeremias, Latvus, Joo, McCarthy and Lohfink). It can be observed that the usage of certain words of divine anger in Deuteronomy repeats its pattern in the Deuteronomistic work. Divine anger occurs very frequently in Deuteronomy and Deuteronomistic History, and is an important theme in these books (Hanson, McCarthy and Joo). Besides, if it is accepted that the book of Deuteronomy is part of the Deuteronomistic work, then it is reasonable to understand that theme in the framework of the Deuteronomistic History which depicts the wrath of God as a working principle in history (McCarthy, Lohfink, Joo and Jeremias). The exile and the destruction of the people were caused by divine wrath (Hanson, Klein, Lohfink, Joo, Jeremias and Grant).¹⁹²

3. Review of scholarship on sanctifying God

The meaning of the holiness of God is different from that of sanctifying God. The holiness of God is said to be more than just one divine attribute, and it includes all the riches and life, power and goodness that God possesses.¹⁹³ In “sanctifying God” or “regarding God as holy,” God is the direct object of the verb “sanctify,” and it is not about a divine attribute. The root קדש has a primary positive sense of

¹⁹² Although a comparison with the ancient Near Eastern texts can input more perspectives on the issue of divine wrath, the lack of parallel text about a punishment similar to the exclusion of Moses makes such comparison not useful in our present study.

¹⁹³ Jules de Vaulx, “Holy,” *DBT* :237.

consecration and belonging, and a secondary sense of separation.¹⁹⁴ The Qal of קדש may be translated as “to be holy,” “to be consecrated” and “to be set apart.”¹⁹⁵ The Hiphil of קדש means causatively “to consecrate,” “to declare holy,”¹⁹⁶ and “to make holy, consecrate, offer, surrender to God as a possession.”¹⁹⁷ When this verb is used with human subject and divine object, for instance in Num 20:12 and 27:14, the Hiphil of קדש means “to treat, consider God as holy.”¹⁹⁸ In Deut 32:51 the Piel of קדש has the sense of “to consecrate,” “to set apart” and “to consider as holy,”¹⁹⁹ it refers to “to treat God as holy/ sanctified.”²⁰⁰ There are only five occurrences in which the verb קדש is used with human subject and divine object (Num 20:12; 27:14; Deut 32:51; Isa 8:13; 29:23). Such small number of occurrence may account for the rare study of the theme of sanctifying God.

Baruch Schwartz has done an in-depth study on Israel’s holiness in the Torah.²⁰¹ Schwartz clarifies three points on understanding the meaning of the root קדש in order to avoid any pitfall. First, Schwartz lists out two distinct meanings of the root קדש in the Hebrew Bible. One of them (he gives the symbol: קדש I) has the sense of “separated,” “belonging to,” and “designated for.”²⁰² This usage is approximated by

¹⁹⁴ Joseph Auneau, “Holiness,” *ECT* 2: 712.

¹⁹⁵ Auneau, “Holiness,” 712.

¹⁹⁶ Auneau, “Holiness,” 712.

¹⁹⁷ Kornfeld, “קדש,” *TDOT* 12: 528.

¹⁹⁸ *HALOT* 2: 1074.

¹⁹⁹ Auneau, “Holiness,” 712.

²⁰⁰ Kornfeld, “קדש,” 528; *HALOT* 2: 1074.

²⁰¹ Baruch J. Schwartz, “Israel’s Holiness: The Torah Traditions,” in *Purity and Holiness: The Heritage of Leviticus* (ed. M. J. H. M. Poorthuis and J. Schwartz; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 47-59.

²⁰² Schwartz, “Israel’s Holiness,” 47.

the terms “holy,” “sacred” and their synonyms and derivatives.²⁰³ It expresses the idea that the persons and objects “are designated as belonging or pertaining especially and exclusively” to God.²⁰⁴ The other one (קדש II) with the meaning “clean” or “purified” is less common.²⁰⁵ The Priestly tradition avoids using the verb קדש with this meaning, while the Chronicles uses קדש and טהר (“to purify”) “quite interchangeably.”²⁰⁶ Second, Schwartz clarifies that the root קדש does not convey any “value judgment.”²⁰⁷ “No intrinsic morality or piety is imputed” to the root in group קדש I.²⁰⁸ The root קדש conveys only “the quality of separateness.”²⁰⁹ Third and finally, Schwartz states that קדש does not convey “the abstract idea” of holiness.²¹⁰ A sacred object is something which “belongs to the divine sphere.”²¹¹

Ka Leung Wong also has summarized that there are five key concepts relating to holiness: separation, fearfulness, being contagious by touch under certain conditions, wholeness and ethical dimension.²¹² Although Schwartz and Ka Leung Wong have clarified some important concepts related to holiness, their studies do not directly address the issue of sanctifying God.

A “holiness spectrum” is proposed by Philip Jenson, and is used to provide a framework for integrating the theory of idealist and that of realist through their

²⁰³ Schwartz, “Israel’s Holiness,” 47.

²⁰⁴ Schwartz, “Israel’s Holiness,” 48.

²⁰⁵ Schwartz, “Israel’s Holiness,” 48.

²⁰⁶ Schwartz, “Israel’s Holiness,” 48.

²⁰⁷ Schwartz, “Israel’s Holiness,” 49.

²⁰⁸ Schwartz, “Israel’s Holiness,” 49.

²⁰⁹ Schwartz, “Israel’s Holiness,” 49.

²¹⁰ Schwartz, “Israel’s Holiness,” 49.

²¹¹ Schwartz, “Israel’s Holiness,” 49.

²¹² Ka Leung Wong, *The Idea of Retribution in the Book of Ezekiel* (VTSup 87; Leiden; Boston; Köln: Brill, 2001), 125.

common polar structure.²¹³ Jenson studies the structure and interpretation of the four basic dimensions of human experience (space, person, rite and time)²¹⁴ and suggests that the principle of “grading” has a major role in presenting the concepts, institutions and rituals.²¹⁵ Although the concept of “order” can provide a valuable guide to unlock the Priestly theology of the cult,²¹⁶ it seems that such concept does not help much on the question of what sanctifying God means.

The recent article by Anna Angelini and Christophe Nihan is quite comprehensive,²¹⁷ but there is also no treatment on the idea of “sanctifying God.” Some scholars have attempted to illustrate the relationships among holy, common/ profane, clean/ pure and unclean/ impure by diagrams.²¹⁸ Although these diagrams can represent how holy is related to various terms in the human sphere, they cannot address the theme of sanctifying God. It is admitted that the observations from the phenomenology of religion, the history of religions and the anthropology of religion all are an indispensable aid to the study of holiness in the Hebrew Bible,²¹⁹ the meaning of “sanctifying God” is not the focus of their concerns. The above discussion shows that there are numerous perspectives to understand the meaning of

²¹³ Philip P. Jenson, *Graded Holiness: A Key to the Priestly Conception of the World* (JSOTSup 106; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 88.

²¹⁴ Jenson, *Graded Holiness*, 88-209.

²¹⁵ Jenson, *Graded Holiness*, 210.

²¹⁶ Jenson, *Graded Holiness*, 215.

²¹⁷ Anna Angelini and Christophe Nihan, “Holiness,” *EBR* 12:34-40.

²¹⁸ See James Barr, “Semantics and Biblical Theology: a contribution to the Discussion” in *Congress Volume, Uppsala 1971* (ed. P. A. H. de Boer; VTSup 22; Leiden: Brill, 1972), 15; Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 3; New York: Doubleday, 1991), 732; Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 3A; New York: Doubleday, 2000), 1721; Gordon J Wenham, *The Book of Leviticus*. (NICOT; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1979), 18-25.

²¹⁹ John G. Gammie, *Holiness in Israel* (OBT; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 41.

holiness of God, but the discussion of “regarding God as holy” is very rare.²²⁰

Sanctifying God as showing His awefulness, power and otherness

In fact, “sanctifying God” is not totally unrelated to divine holiness. God Himself is holy, and He is also the source of holiness.²²¹ “Sanctifying God” does not mean that there is a change in the status of God from less holy to more holy. It means the holiness of God is manifested. If we understand that “sanctifying God” means “manifesting the holiness of God,” the studies of some scholars on the concept of holiness are still worthy of consulting.

Although there is no mention of “sanctifying God” in Rudolf Otto’s *The Idea of the Holy*, his framework has provided important terms for commentators to express the meaning of sanctifying God. Otto creates a tradition on the study of “the holy.” He adopts from the Latin *numen* and coins a word “numinous” to stand for the experience of “the holy” in the human mind.²²² The nature of “numinous” can be reflected in the mind in terms of an incomprehensible feeling of “*mysterium*

²²⁰ There are many articles and essays that discuss the theme the holiness of God. For instance: Joseph Auneau, “Holiness,” *ECT* 2:712-713; Philip J. Budd, “Holiness and Cult,” in *The World of Ancient Israel: Sociological, Anthropological and Political Perspectives: Essays* (ed. R. E. Clements; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 275-298; Thomas B. Dozeman, “The Holiness of God in Contemporary Jewish and Christian Biblical Theology,” in *God’s Word for Our World, Vol. 2: Theological and cultural studies in honor of Simon John De Vries* (ed. J. Harold Ellens et al.; London: T&T Clark International, 2004), 24-36; Philip Jenson, “Holiness in the Priestly Writings of the Old Testament,” in *Holiness: Past and Present* (ed. S. C. Barton; London: T&T Clark International, 2003), 93-121; Hans G. Kippenberg, “Sacred and Profane,” *EC* 4:803-806; Baruch A. Levine, “The Language of Holiness: Perceptions of the Sacred in the Hebrew Bible,” in *Background for the Bible* (ed. M. P. O’Connor and D. N. Freedman; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1987), 241-255; James Muilenburg, “Holiness,” *IDB* 2:616-625; John Rogerson, “What is Holiness?,” in *Holiness: Past and Present* (ed. S. C. Barton; London: T&T Clark, 2003), 3-21; David P. Wright, “Holiness (OT),” *ABD* 3:237-249.

²²¹ David P. Wright, “Holiness (OT),” *ABD* 3:237.

²²² Rudolf Otto, *The Idea of Holy: An Inquiry into the Non-rational Factor in the Idea of the Divine and its Relation to the Rational* (2d ed.; trans. John W. Harvey; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1950), 6-7.

tremendum” (aweful mystery).²²³ “To keep a thing holy” is “to appraise it by the category of the numinous.”²²⁴ Otto uses different terms to express the meaning of “the holy”: “awefulness,”²²⁵ “overpoweringness,”²²⁶ “energy,”²²⁷ “the wholly other,”²²⁸ and “fascination.”²²⁹ In addition, Otto’s other expressions related to “holiness” of YHWH are “His fury,” “His jealousy,” “His wrath” and “the consuming fire.”²³⁰

The most influential three terms of Otto are: *power*, *awefulness* and *the wholly other*.²³¹ Some commentators think of the phrase sanctifying God as showing His *power*: demonstrating God’s power,²³² might,²³³ mighty works,²³⁴ mighty wonders²³⁵ and authority.²³⁶ The religion historian Mircea Eliade claims that the sacred and the profane are two modes of being in the world. The holiness or “the sacred” is “the opposite of the profane.”²³⁷ These modes are two existential

²²³ Otto, *Holy*, 12.

²²⁴ Otto, *Holy*, 13.

²²⁵ Otto, *Holy*, 13.

²²⁶ Otto, *Holy*, 19.

²²⁷ Otto, *Holy*, 23.

²²⁸ Otto, *Holy*, 25.

²²⁹ Otto, *Holy*, 31.

²³⁰ Otto, *Holy*, 76.

²³¹ Some scholars use Otto’s several terms together to express the concept of holiness, for instance, Walther Eichrodt also uses the expressions such as “fearful *mysterium*” and “marvellous power.” He points out that the Priestly and cultic idea of holiness is that God “is unapproachable because of his complete ‘otherness’ and perfection when compared with all created things.” See Walther Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament* (trans. John Baker; OTL 2 vols.; London: SCM Press, 1961-1967), 1: 270-73.

²³² Gray, *Numbers*, 263; Budd, *Numbers*, 218; Ashley, *Numbers*, 386; Levine, *Leviticus*, 59; Gerstenberger, *Leviticus*, 118; Oswalt, *Isaiah 1-39*, 234.

²³³ Gray, *Numbers*, 263; Budd, *Numbers*, 218.

²³⁴ Davies, *Numbers*, 206.

²³⁵ Noth, *Numbers*, 147.

²³⁶ Levine, *Leviticus*, 59.

²³⁷ Mircea Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion* (trans. Willard R. Trask; New York: Harcourt, 1959), 10.

situations assumed by man in his history.²³⁸ He explains that the act of manifestation of the sacred (*hierophany*) is that something sacred show itself to us.²³⁹ The sacred, as understood by primitives and pre-modern human society, is equivalent to a *power* and reality.²⁴⁰ In addition, John Goldingay states that “holiness has something of the dangerous *power* of nuclear energy.”²⁴¹ Furthermore, Derek Tiball understands that when God reveals Himself as holy, He displays His holiness in awesome *power* to His people.²⁴² Jacob Milgrom also identifies sanctifying God as providing awe and respect for His *power*.²⁴³

Others stress the human response to God. The transcendence of God causes people to fear and respect him, they take sanctifying God to be understood as showing His *Awefulness*: manifesting God’s inapproachability,²⁴⁴ honour,²⁴⁵ respect,²⁴⁶ reverence²⁴⁷ and fear.²⁴⁸ Others focus on the difference between God and human being. It shows that God is “separated” from human being. They take it to mean showing His *otherness*: acknowledging God’s wholly otherness,²⁴⁹ otherness,²⁵⁰ god-ness²⁵¹ and purity.²⁵²

²³⁸ Eliade, *Sacred*, 14.

²³⁹ Eliade, *Sacred*, 11.

²⁴⁰ Eliade, *Sacred*, 12.

²⁴¹ John Goldingay, *Old Testament Theology* (3 vols.; Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter Varsity Press, 2003-09), 1:412.

²⁴² Derek Tiball, *The Message of Leviticus: Free to be Holy* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 2005), 32.

²⁴³ Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, 602.

²⁴⁴ Wenham, *Numbers*, 151.

²⁴⁵ Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 385.

²⁴⁶ Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 385.

²⁴⁷ Budd, *Numbers*, 218.

²⁴⁸ Budd, *Numbers*, 218.

²⁴⁹ Noordtzij, *Numbers*, 178.

²⁵⁰ Noordtzij, *Numbers*, 178.

²⁵¹ Goldingay, *Numbers and Deuteronomy*, 50.

Sanctifying God as showing His glory

In his book *Holiness of Israel*, John Gammie provides a systematic study on three main stream traditions' understanding of holiness (Priestly,²⁵³ Prophetic²⁵⁴ and Wisdom²⁵⁵) and also the variations of the three types on holiness. He claims that the concept of the holiness of God is a central concept in the Hebrew Bible.²⁵⁶ In the tradition of Priestly theology, Gammie has treated the tabernacle,²⁵⁷ holy time,²⁵⁸ rites of passage,²⁵⁹ holy persons²⁶⁰ and holy acts.²⁶¹ Gammie critiques that Rudolf Otto does not use "glory" in his initial descriptive treatment or in his treatment of the Hebrew Bible.²⁶² Based on the studies of Rolf Rendtorff and Moshe Weinfeld, Gammie points out that "glory" frequently represents divine majesty.²⁶³ Then, he claims that the glory of God is a theme common to the Priestly, Prophetic and apocalyptic literature.²⁶⁴ Glory is the aspect of the holiness that divinity manifests in some way to human eyes.²⁶⁵ John Hartley also states that when YHWH manifests Himself, His holiness is visible as glory.²⁶⁶ Similarly, Gordon Wenham understands

²⁵² Wenham, *Numbers*, 151.

²⁵³ Gammie, *Holiness*, 9-44.

²⁵⁴ Gammie, *Holiness*, 71-101.

²⁵⁵ Gammie, *Holiness*, 125-149.

²⁵⁶ Gammie, *Holiness*, 197.

²⁵⁷ Gammie, *Holiness*, 14-19.

²⁵⁸ Gammie, *Holiness*, 20-22.

²⁵⁹ Gammie, *Holiness*, 24-32.

²⁶⁰ Gammie, *Holiness*, 32-37.

²⁶¹ Gammie, *Holiness*, 37-41.

²⁶² Gammie, *Holiness*, 7.

²⁶³ Gammie, *Holiness*, 7.

²⁶⁴ Gammie, *Holiness*, 197.

²⁶⁵ Gammie, *Holiness*, 197.

²⁶⁶ John Hartley, *Leviticus* (WBC 4; Dallas, Texas: Word Books, 1992), lvi.

sanctifying God as showing His glory.²⁶⁷

There are a few commentators who highlight the love of God. This group gives a special understanding of divine holiness. The holy God is not really inapproachable, but He cares about human beings. Thus, to sanctify God is to show God's mercy,²⁶⁸ to represent His care, concern and providence.²⁶⁹ However, such representations and translations are not supported by any strong argument.

From the above discussion, we may conclude that there are four ways to express the phrase "sanctifying God." It can mean manifesting God's *power*, *awefulness*, *otherness* and *glory*. Could these four dimensions be used to clarify the fault of Moses in Num 20:1-13? We will discuss it in Chapter Seven and Eight.

4. Conclusion

Chapter Three is a review of scholarship related to the present study. It is divided into three sections. The first area we have discussed is about the source of Num 20:1-13; 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52. Based on the persuasive arguments of Perlitt and Nihan, the solution to that problem adopted in this chapter is that Num 20:1-13; Num 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52 are probably post-Priestly. It is believed that only style and phraseology is not enough to classify a passage to be Priestly because later redactors can imitate the style of the Priestly School. There are also

²⁶⁷ Wenham, *Leviticus*, 156.

²⁶⁸ L'Heureux, *Numbers*, 87.

²⁶⁹ Stubbs, *Numbers*, 161.

observations of the mixture of Priestly and non-Priestly language in the three passages. It is possible that the later scribal redactor has inherited the theologies of the Priestly School and the Deuteronomic School during the last stage(s) of the formation of the Pentateuch. Although there are different models for the formation of the Pentateuch (Kratz's Enneateuch model, Otto's Hexateuch-Pentateuch model, Römer's linkage formation between the Triteuch and Deuteronomy model, and Knohl's Holiness School redaction model), there is still a tendency that the Pentateuch texts can be classified to "pre-Priestly," "Priestly," and "post-Priestly." The approaches of Kratz, Otto, Römer and Knohl all perceive the three texts (Num 20:1-13; 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52) as post-Priestly, and as the result of supplements. But post-Priestly does not exclude the possibility that the final redactor would have been affected by the theology of the Priestly School and the Holiness School. Blending the languages and theologies of different schools, the later redactor produced a new tradition which could speak to his situation.

Second, previous scholarship on divine anger is discussed. We find that the meaning of divine anger in a particular passage should be *primarily* understood in its own context. Further, an accurate description of the theme of divine wrath should include a precise study on the words used for the anger of God. Finally, the theme of divine anger in Deuteronomy can be studied under the framework of the Deuteronomistic History

Third, a review of scholarship on sanctifying God is provided. There are

numerous perspectives to understand the meaning of holiness of God, but the discussion of “sanctifying God” is very rare. But we can still find that there are four ways to express the phrase “sanctifying God.” It can mean manifesting God’s power, awefulness, otherness, and glory.

Chapter Four: Divine Anger on Moses in Deut 1-3

In Chapter Three, it has been discussed that we have to carry out a contextual exegesis of Deut 1-3, a word study on divine anger in the book of Deuteronomy, and an interpretation of the theme of divine anger in the framework of the Deuteronomistic History. In this present chapter, we will interpret the two passages in Deut 1-3 to determine the relationship between divine anger and the exclusion of Moses. The usage of different words and expressions for divine anger in Deuteronomy will be analysed at the end of this chapter. Deut 4 will be interpreted in the framework of the Deuteronomistic History in the next chapter.

1. Was Moses innocent in Deut 1:19-46?

In Deut 1:37, Moses said that YHWH was angry with him because of the Israelites. The verb **אָנַף** occurs four times in the book of Deuteronomy and fourteen times in the Hebrew Bible, and is always used with God as its subject.¹ In most of the instances, the human objects (of the verb **אָנַף**) have sinned.² Why did Moses say that YHWH was angry with him? Has Moses sinned? What has Moses done?

(1) The context of Deut 1:37

¹ Deut 1:37; 4:21; 9:8, 20; 1 Kgs 8:46; 11:9; 2 Kgs 17:18; 2 Chr 6:36; Ezr 9:14; Ps 2:12; 60:3 (1 ET); 79:5; 85:6 (5 ET); Isa 12:1.

² See the discussion in the Excursus in section 3 of this chapter.

The context of Deut 1:37 is the verdict of YHWH to the Israelites (Deut 1:34-40) in the spy story.

In Deut 1-3, the two generations of the Israelites learnt a lesson from history.³ The importance of *obedience to YHWH*, who is also the owner of the whole land,⁴ is illustrated by a contrast of the battles of the two generations of Israelites who left Egypt.⁵ In the first battle (Deut 1:19-46), the Israelites were defeated; later after 38 years, the second generation won two battles. Deut 1:19-46 can be summarized into five sections:

- | | |
|--------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| I. 1:19-23 | After Moses' first exhortation, the Israelites suggested the proposal of sending the spies. |
| II. 1:24-28 | Having heard the spies' reports, the people did not want to go up to take the land. |
| III. 1:29-33 | Moses gave his second exhortation, the people did not believe Moses' words. |
| IV. 1:34-40 | YHWH gave the verdict to the people |
| V. 1:41-46 | Further disobedience of the Israelites |

The above structure highlights the *rebellion* of the people.⁶ The reason for the

³ Richard D. Nelson, "Divine Warrior Theology in Deuteronomy," in *A God so Near: Essays on Old Testament Theology in Honor of Patrick D. Miller* (ed. B. A. Strawn and N. R. Bowen; Winona Lake, Ind: Eisenbrauns, 2003), 252.

⁴ God has the right to give a certain area of the land to a certain nation (Deut 1:8, 20, 21; 2:5, 9, 19, 24, 31; 3:2, 20).

⁵ In Deut 1:26, 32 and 43, the first exodus generation did not obey the words of YHWH, while in Deut 2:8, 13, 33, 37; 3:3, the second exodus generation obeyed the commands of YHWH.

⁶ Olson also gives the outline of the story in five parts:

A. The mission of the spies into Canaan and their report (1:19-25)

B. The response of the people-fear and a yearning for security and safety of slavery in Egypt (1:26-28)

failure of the first battle is explained in Deut 1:19-46. Before the first battle, the Israelites sent spies to the land. The people heard the good version of the report of the spies (Deut 1:25), but they rebelled against the command of YHWH (Deut 1:26). Although Moses encouraged them, they did not trust YHWH (Deut 1:30-32). Therefore, YHWH was angry and swore a new oath. The Promised Land would only be given to Caleb, Joshua and the second generation (Deut 1:35-39). However, the first generation did not accept this judgment, and they insisted to go up and fight. YHWH warned them not to go up and not to fight. The Israelites rebelled against YHWH's command again, and they were defeated (Deut 1:41-46). The first battle was lost because of their successive rebellions against YHWH. We can find that there are similarities in Part II, III and V.

	Part II Deut 1:24-28	Part III Deut 1:29-33	Part V Deut 1:41-46
The words from Moses or the spies	"It is a good land..."	"Do not fear..."	"Do not go up nor fight... otherwise you will be defeated"
The negative response of the Israelites	rebelled (v.26)	did not believe (v.32)	did not listen and rebelled (v.43)

Part II, III and V are in a similar pattern: there is always an address to the Israelites before their response.⁷ The collective responses of the Israelites are: "rebelled" (Deut 1:26), "did not believe" (Deut 1:32) and "did not listen and rebelled" (Deut

C. Moses' appeal and the people's refusal (1:29-33)

D. The old generation will die (including Moses) (1:34-40)

E. The people try to take the promise into their own hands (1:41-46)

However, Olson's outline does not show the theme of the responses of people. See Olson, *Deuteronomy*, 25.

⁷ Miller also sees that the narrative unfolds in a series of responses to Moses' command. See Miller, *Deuteronomy*, 31.

1:43). All are *negative*.

(2) The complex relation between Num 13-14 and Deut 1:19-46

There is another version of the spy narrative in Num 13-14.⁸ This version is more detailed, and can be compared with the Deuteronomic version spy story.⁹ If

⁸ Num 13-14 is one of the incidents of a series of murmurings in the wilderness which starts from Num 11. The first incident is that the people took to complaining bitterly before YHWH (Num 11:1-3). The second is that the people wanted meat to eat, not just manna. This complaint initiates the incident of the quail (Num 11:4-35). The third one is that Miriam and Aaron spoke against Moses in Num 12. The spy story in Num 13-14 is the fourth one. In all of the incidents, Moses prayed or said to YHWH on behalf of those ones who have complained (Num 11:2, 11, 21; 12:13; 14:13-19). Dennis Olson states that the spy story has been linked by later editors to the census lists in Num 1 and Num 26 which form the basis of the structure of the book. His arguments are: firstly, in Num 14:29, the phrase “from twenty years old and upward,” is the recurrent age formula which is used in Num 1. Therefore, all those numbered “from twenty years old and upward” of the first exodus generation in Num 1, are those who are condemned to be destroyed in the wilderness in Num 13-14. Secondly, the phrase “who are able to go forth to war,” in Num 1:3 implies an upcoming war. The first military operation prepared by the census in Num 1 is the battle after sending spies in Num 13. Thirdly, the spy story is linked to Num 26 which marks the new census of the second exodus generation of Israelites. Num 26:65, “For YHWH has said to them, ‘They shall die in the wilderness.’” recalls the spy story. Fourthly, in Num 14:20, YHWH has promised Moses that he will forgive the Israelites as Moses had asked him to forgive them (Num 14:13-19). The census list in Num 26 is a confirmation of the word of YHWH. Therefore, Num 13-14 is an important passage in the book of Numbers. See Dennis T. Olson, *The Death of the Old and the Birth of the New: The Framework of the Book of Numbers and the Pentateuch* (BJS 71; Chico, Cali.: Scholars Press, 1985), 138-41.

⁹ Scholars who agree with the source criticism of the Pentateuch commonly think that Num 13-14 is an interwoven composite of the so-called “J” and “P.” This theory can explain the occurrence of the doublets and inconsistencies in Num 13-14. The following table shows the classification of the “J” and “P” passages in Num 13-14 by some scholars:

Scholar	P	J/ JE/ non-P
Gray (1903)	13:1-17a, 21-26, 32; 14:1*, 2, 5-7, 10, 26-38	13:17b-20, 22-24, 27-31, 33; 14:1*, 3-4, 8-9, 11-25, 39-45
Noth (1966)	13:1-17a, 21, 25-26, 32-33; 14:1-10, 26-38	13:17b-20, 22-24, 27-31; 14:11-25, 39-45
de Vaux (1970)	13:1-17a, 21, 25-26, 32-33; 14:1-3, 5-10, 26-38	13:17b-20, 22-24, 27-31; 14:4, 11-25, 39-45
van Seters (1994)	13:1-2, 4-17a, 21, 25-26, 32-33; 14:5-10, 26-38	13:3, 17b-20, 22-24, 27-31; 14:1-4, 11-25, 39-45
Friedman (2003)	13:1-16, 25-26, 32; 14:1-3, 5-10, 26-38	13:17-24, 27-31, 33; 14:4, 11-25, 39-45
Boorer (2003)	13:1-17a, 21, 25-26, 32-33; 14:1-3, 5-10, 26-38	13:17b-20, 22-24, 27-31; 14:4, 11-25, 39-45
Seebass (2003)	13:1-2, 4-17a, 21, 25-26, 32-33; 14:1a, 2, 5-7, 10, 26-29, 33, 34b-38	13:3, 17b-20, 22-24, 27-31; 14:1b, 3-4, 8-9, 11-25, 39-45

See Gray, *Numbers*, 129-132; Noth, *Numbers*, 101-111; Roland de Vaux, “The Settlement of the Israelites in Southern Palestine and the Origins of the Tribe of Judah,” in *Translating and*

Num 13-14 is earlier than Deut 1:19-46, the possibility that Deut 1:19-46 can assess or share the tradition of Num 13-14 will be greater. On the contrary, if Num 13-14 is later than Deut 1:19-46, it would be difficult to maintain that Num 13-14 can provide exegetical background for Deut 1:19-46. Therefore, it is proper to investigate the relationship between Num 13-14 and Deut 1:19-46.

If the content of Deut 1:19-46 is arranged according to the sequence of incidents of Num 13-14, we may find that there are three parallel accounts of the spy story, two of which (so-called “P” and “non-P”)¹⁰ are in Num 13-14. The following table lists out the main events in the three accounts.

Main events in the three accounts of the spy story

	“P” in Num 13-14	“non-P” in Num 13-14	Deut 1:19-46
I) The initiation of the spy mission	---	---	The first exhortation of Moses (1:19-21)
	The command of YHWH (13:1-2)	---	The suggestion of the people (1:22)
	Moses’ action: sent the men (13:3)	---	Moses’ action: took twelve men (1:23)
	The name list of the spies (13:4-16)	---	---
	Moses sent them out	---	---

Understanding the Old Testament: Essays in Honor of Herbert Gordon May (ed. H. T. Frank and W. L. Reed; Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 1970), 109; van Seters, *Life of Moses*, 366-370; R. E. Friedman, *The Bible with Source Revealed* (New York: Harper One, 2003), 262-265; Sue Boorer, “Kaleidoscopic Patterns and the Shaping of Experience,” in *The Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty-First Century* (eds. Marvin A. Sweeney and Ehud Ben Zvi; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2003), 214-215; Seebass, *Numeri 10,11-22,1*, 96.

¹⁰ Since the existence of the so-called Yahwist (J) is very controversial in current scholarship of the Pentateuch, this present chapter will use the term “non-P” instead of “J.” See Thomas B. Dozeman and Konrad Schmid, eds., *A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation* (SBL SymS 34; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2006); Rolf Rendtorff, *The Problem of the Process of Transmission in the Pentateuch* (trans. J. J. Scullion; JSOTSup 89; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990). Also, the term “P” is used for the sake of convenience. The Priestly nature of the “P” passages is questioned in recent models accounting for the formation of Numbers and the Pentateuch. See the discussion in Chapter Three of this dissertation.

	(13:17a)		
	---	Moses' words to the spies (13:17b-20)	---
II) The route of the spies	The route of the spies (13:21)	The route of the spies (13:22-24)	The route of the spies (1:24)
	The return of the spies (13:25-26)	---	---
	The fruit of the land (13:26b)	The fruit of the land (13:23b)	The fruit of the land (1:25a)
III) The report(s) of the spies	---	The first report of the spies: "The Land flows with milk and honey...yet the people are strong." (13:27-29)	The first report of the spies: "A good land." (1:25b)
	---	The first exhortation of Caleb (13:30)	---
	---	The negative response of other spies (13:31)	---
	The second report of the spies: The land devours its inhabitants (13:32)	The second report of the spies: We saw the Nephilim (13:33)	---
IV) The response of the people	The grumbling of the people (14:1-3)	The grumbling of the people (14:4)	The grumbling of the people (1:26-28)
V) The response(s) of the leaders to the grumbling of the people	Response of Moses and Aaron (14:5)	---	---
	---	---	The second exhortation of Moses (1:29-31)
	The second exhortation of Caleb (14:6-7)	The second exhortation of Caleb (14:8-9)	---
VI) The people did not listen	The negative response of the people (14:10)	---	The negative response of the people (1:32-33)
VII) The verdict of YHWH and the Prayer of Moses	---	The first speech of YHWH (14:11-12)	---
	---	Moses' intercessory prayer (14:13-19)	---
	The third speech of YHWH (14:26-35)	The second speech of YHWH (14:20-25)	The verdict of YHWH (1:34-40)

VIII) The death of the ten spies	The death of the ten spies (14:36-38)	---	---
IX) Further disobedience of the people	---	Further disobedience of the people (14:39-45)	Further disobedience of the people (1:40-46)

In general the commentators suppose that Deut 1:19-46 is dependent on the non-P (so called “J”)¹¹ source or tradition. For instance, Martin Noth thinks that the Deuteronomistic version is an independent variation of the theme based on the non-P version.¹² He believes that “the beginning of the J narrative has been removed by an editor in favour of P.”¹³ The Deuteronomistic version, according to Noth, can help to clarify the contents and wording of non-P.¹⁴ However, such one-way direction dependency between Deut 1:19-46 and Num 13-14 cannot be used to account for their complex relationship. In fact we can find the evidence for the dependence in *both* directions. One of the persuasive arguments for the usage of non-P by the Deuteronomic version can be found in Deut 1:35-36 and its parallel texts in Num 14:22-23 (non-P). Why is the verb “see” used in Deut 1:35-36?

Num 14:22-23 (non-P)	Deut 1:35
22 כי כל האנשים	----
הראים את כבדי ואת אתתי	----
אשר עשיתי במצרים ובמדבר...	----
23 אם יראו	אם יראה...
את הארץ	את הארץ הטובה
אשר נשבעתי לאבתם	אשר נשבעתי לחת לאבתיכם

¹¹ The existence of E source is now widely questioned. See Jan Christian Gertz, “The Overall Context of Genesis -2Kings,” in *T&T Clark Handbook of the Old Testament* (trans. Peter Altmann; London: T&T Clark, 2012), 256. This paper will use “J” instead of “JE.”

¹² Noth, *Numbers*, 102.

¹³ Noth, *Numbers*, 104.

¹⁴ Noth, *Numbers*, 102. Noth also suggests that the lost beginning of the non-P narrative can be reconstructed on the basis of Deut 1:22. See Noth, *Pentateuchal traditions*, 132, n.374. Ludwig Schmidt also thinks that the author of Deut 1:19-46 depends upon J literarily. See Ludwig Schmidt, “Die Kundschaftererzählung in Num 13-14 und Dtn 1,19-46,” *ZAW* 114 (2002): 40-58.

Num 14:22-23 (non-P)	Deut 1:35
14:22 Surely all the men	----
14:22 who <i>have seen</i> My glory and My signs	----
14:22 which I made in Egypt and in the wilderness...	----
14:23 No one shall <i>see</i>	“No one shall <i>see</i> ...
14:23 the land	the good land
14:23 which I swore to their fathers,	which I swore to give to your fathers,

The judgment against the first generation was that they would not ראה (“to see”) the land (Num 14:23; Deut 1:35) and the gift given to Caleb was that he would “see” the land (Deut 1:36). Later, in Deut 1:37-38 the verb בוא (“to enter”) is used. The verb ראה in Deut 1:35-36 seems unnecessary.¹⁵ It can just say that no one shall “enter” the good land because the combination of the verb בוא (“to enter”) and הארץ הטוב (“the good land”) can be found in Deut 6:18 and 8:7. However, the verb “see” in Num 14:23 is important since it is against the Israelites who “have seen” the glory and signs of YHWH. The punishment of not allowing seeing the land corresponds to the sin of failing to obey God’s word after seeing the glory and signs of God. Thus, the “seeing” in Num 14:23 is connected to its previous content, while there is no such connection in the “seeing” in Deut 1:35. It is likely that Deut 1 depends on the non-P tradition of Num 14:23, and not the other way round.¹⁶

However, there is also evidence for a late date of non-P in Num 13-14 which

¹⁵ The combination of “enter” with “land” in Deuteronomy occurs 44 times, while the combination of “see” with “land” occurs only 8 times. This shows that “see the land” is less common in Deuteronomy.

¹⁶ Another evidence is that Num 13:28 seems to be more primitive than Deut 1:28. So it is possible that Deut 1:28 uses the non-P in Num 13:28 as well. See Römer, “The Book of Deuteronomy,” in *The History of Israel’s Tradition: The Heritage of Martin Noth* (ed. S. McKenzie and M. Graham; JSOTSup 182; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press), 209.

has used the Deuteronomic version. For example, Num 13:22-24 (non-P), which is a parallel texts of Deut 1:24-25, is more elaborated:

Num 13:22-24 (non-P)	Deut 1:24-25a
	24 ויפנו
22 ויעלו בנגב	ויעלו ההרה
ויבא עד חברון	
ושם אחימן ששי ותלמי	
ילידי הענק	
וחברון שבע שנים נבנתה	
לפני צען מצרים	
23 ויבאו עד נחל אשכול	ויבאו עד נחל אשכול
	וירגלו אתה
ויכרתו משם זמורה	25a ויקחו בידם מפרי הארץ
ואשכול ענבים אחד	
וישאהו במוט בשנים	
ומן הרמנים ומן התאנים	
24 למקום ההוא קרא נחל אשכול	
על אדות האשכול	
אשר כרתו משם בני ישראל	

Num 13:22-24 (non-P)	Deut 1:24-25a
	24 And they left
22 And they went up through the Negev,	and they went up into the hill country,
and they came to Hebron	
and there Ahiman, Sheshai and Talmai,	
the descendants of the Anak were.	
And Hebron was built seven years	
before Zoan of Egypt.	
23 And they came to the valley of Eshcol	and they came to the Valley of Eshcol
	and they explored it.
and from there they cut down a branch	25a And they took some of the land's
with one cluster of grapes;	produce with their hands ...
and they carried it on a pole by two,	
with some of the pomegranates and the	
figs.	

24 That place was called the valley of Eshcol,	
because of the cluster	
which the Israelites cut down from there.	

It has been pointed out that the mentioning of Hebron (Num 13:22) by non-P is used to anticipate the divine word concerning Caleb in Num 14:24.¹⁷ Besides, the theme of the fruit of Eshcol, which is elaborated into miraculous abundance, is related to the etiology of it.¹⁸ However, there is no such elaboration and etiology in the Deuteronomic version. It seems most reasonable to suppose that non-P has taken up the material in Deut 1 and has developed it further.¹⁹

In addition, there is a difference in the expression used to modified the Promised Land in Deut 1:25c and Num 13:27:

Num 13:27b (non-P)	Deut 1:25c
ויאמרו	ויאמרו
באנו אל הארץ אשר שלחתנו	
וגם זבת חלב ודבש הוא ...	טובה הארץ
	אשר יהוה אלהינו נתן לנו

Num 13:27b (non-P)	Deut 1:25c
and they said,	and they said,
“We came to the land to which you sent us	
and indeed flowing with milk and honey...	“ (It is a) good land
	which YHWH our God is giving to us.”

In Num 13:27b, the land is modified by “flowing with milk and honey,” while in Deut 1:25c the land is called a “good” land. The modifier “flowing with milk and honey” can be found in Deut 6:3; 11:9; 26:9, 15; 27:3 and 31:20, and therefore some

¹⁷ van Seters, *Life of Moses*, 374.

¹⁸ van Seters, *Life of Moses*, 374.

¹⁹ van Seters, *Life of Moses*, 374.

commentators have classified it as a Deuteronomistic phrase.²⁰ If the author of Deut 1 uses the non-P passage in Num 13:27b as his source, it is hardly likely that he would have changed “flowing with milk and honey” to “good.”²¹

Moreover, in Num 14:12 it is said that YHWH would strike the Israelites with pestilence, and He would disinherit them. Then, He would make of Moses a nation greater and mightier than the Israelites. There is a sharp distinction between Moses and the Israelites. However, in Deut 1:37, Moses had to receive a punishment with the Israelites. Moses was not permitted to enter the land, as the Israelites could not see the land. Here, we cannot find a sharp distinction. If the author of Deut 1:19-46 has known Num 14:12, it is hard to understand how they would have been able to write Deut 1:37.²² Furthermore, according to the Numbers, the Israelites were saved by the intercessory prayer of Moses (Num 14:13-19, non-P). YHWH replied to Moses that He would forgive the people just as Moses had asked. If the Deuteronomists have used the non-P source, it is difficult to believe that they dropped out Moses’ intercessory prayer in Num 14.²³

In regard to the relation between the “P” passage and the Deuteronomic passage, Eryl Davies says that none of the parallels between Deut 1:19-46 and Num 13-14 stems from the so-called Priestly writing’s version of the spy story, “the literary link may be more closely defined as being between Deut 1:19-46 and the J passages in

²⁰ van Seters, *Life of Moses*, 374.

²¹ van Seters, *Life of Moses*, 374-5; Martin Rose, *Deuteronomist und Jahwist: Untersuchungen zu den Berührungspunkten beider Literaturwerke* (AThANT 67; Zürich: Theologischer, 1981), 291.

²² Römer, *So-Called*, 125.

²³ Römer, *So-Called*, 125.

Num 13(-14).”²⁴ Therefore, according to Davies, the Deuteronomic account does not reflect any of the peculiarities of P’s style.²⁵ However, Davies may have overlooked the following examples that give the signs of dependence between Deut 1:9-46 and the “P” texts in Num 13-14.

First, there is an elaboration on the identity of Caleb and Joshua in the

Deuteronomic version:

Num 14:24 (non-P)	Num 14:30 (“P”)	Deut 1:36, 38
ועבדי כלב...	כי אם כלב בן יפנה...	36 זולתי כלב בן יפנה...
...וימלא אחרי...		36 מלא אחרי יהוה...
	ויהושע בן נון	38 יהושע בן נון...

Num 14:24 (non-P)	Num 14:30 (“P”)	Deut 1:36, 38
<i>But My servant Caleb...</i>	<i>... except Caleb son of Jephunneh</i>	36 <i>except Caleb son of Jephunneh...</i>
<i>...and he has wholly followed after Me...</i>		36 <i>...wholly followed after YHWH...</i>
	<i>and Joshua son of Nun.</i>	38 <i>Joshua son of Nun...</i>

There is a repetition that Caleb will enter the land (Num 14:24 [non-P] and 14:30[“P”]). The non-P version modifies Caleb by the expression “my servant,” while the “P” version called him “the son of Jephunneh.” In the non-P version we can find the character of Caleb, “wholly followed after me [=YHWH].” Such description of Caleb’s character is absent in the “P” version. In addition, Joshua is mentioned in the “P” version, but not the non-P version. Caleb is mentioned once in Deut 1:19-46 in which he is modified by “the son of Jephunneh” as the “P” version, as well as “and he wholly followed YHWH” as the non-P version. “Joshua son of

²⁴ Davies, *Numbers*, 129.

²⁵ Davies, *Numbers*, 129.

Nun” can also be found in the Deuteronomic version as in “P.” Therefore, we can find a mixing of “P” with non-P in Deut 1:36 and 38. It is possible that the Deuteronomists have used both versions and merged them into one.

In fact, the first mention of Caleb in Deuteronomy is in Deut 1:36, in which he was appreciated by YHWH. Both Caleb and Joshua could enter the land. But we may not understand why they could. They were passive and had not done anything special. If we only rely on Deut 1, we are not sure that Caleb and Joshua were two of the spies. We do not know they had been to Hebron. And when YHWH said that he would give the land on which Caleb set foot (Deut 1:36), we do not know what land Caleb would receive. It is likely that the Deuteronomists not only uses a source but presuppose their reader’s knowledge of that source.²⁶ The presupposed knowledge that Caleb and Joshua were spies and had given a good report about the land in the Numeri version (“P” and non-P) would make the Deuteronomic version more understandable.

Second, Deut 1:39 is parallel to Num 14:31 (“P”):

Num 14:3(“P”), 31(“P”)	Deut 1:39
3 ... נשינו וטפנו יהיו לבז ...	----
31 וטפכם	וטפכם
אשר אמרתם לבז יהיה ...	אשר אמרתם לבז יהיה ...

Num 14:3(“P”), 31(“P”)	Deut 1:39
3 ...Our wives and our little ones will become booty...	----

²⁶ Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 127.

31 And your little ones,	And your little ones,
31 whom you said would become booty...	whom you said would become booty...

YHWH quoted the saying of the first generation to the second generation that the little ones “would become booty” (Num 14:31[“P”]; Deut 1:39). Deut 1:39 refers to an aspect of the people’s fearful reaction to the adverse report of conditions in the land, but there is no earlier hint of their sayings concerning their children.²⁷ When did the Israelites say that their little ones would become booty? We cannot find any hint in Deut 1. However, from Num 14:3 (“P”) we know that the Israelites said that their wives and our little ones would become booty when they grumbled against Moses. The possibility that the Deuteronomistic version uses the “P” version is higher than the other way round.²⁸

Third, Deut 1:40 is parallel to another “P” text in Num 14:25:

Num 14:3-4(“P”), 25 (“P”)	Deut 1:40
3...שוב מצרימה	
4...נתנה ראש ונשובה מצרימה	----
25...וסעו לכם המדבר	פנו...לכם וסעו המדברה
דרך ים סוף	דרך ים סוף

Num 14:3-4(“P”), 25 (“P”)	Deut 1:40
3 ... return to Egypt.	
4 ...Let us appoint a head and return to Egypt.	----
25 turn and set out for yourselves to the wilderness	...turn for yourselves and set out to the wilderness,
by the way of the Reed Sea.	by the way of the Reed Sea.

The command “to turn to the way of the Reed Sea” in Num 14:25 (“P”) can be

²⁷ Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 127.

²⁸ It is also possible that the author of Deut 1:39 assumed that the reader has known the saying of the Israelites in Num 14:3. However, Lohfink argues that the first subordinate clause was a late expansion taken from Num 14:31. See Lohfink, “Canonical Signals,” 30-43.

viewed as a punishment which corresponds to the desire of the Israelites. The people wanted to return to Egypt (Num 14:4 [“P”]) and YHWH fulfilled their desire by commanding them to set out by the way of the Reed Sea (Num 14:25). The command of YHWH in Deut 1:40 could be understood in a similar sense if it presupposes the people’s suggestion of returning to Egypt.

Moreover, there are nearly word for word parallels in Deut 1:25 and Num 13:26(“P”):

Num 13:26 (“P”)	Deut 1:25
...וישיבו אותם דבר...	...וישיבו אתנו דבר...
and they brought back to them a report ...	and they brought back to us a report...

Furthermore, in Deut 1:35, the Israelites are called הרע הזה (“this evil generation”), the adjective רע (“evil”) does not occur in the non-P version, but appears in the “P” version (Num 14:27, 35) in which they are called הערה הרעה הזאת (“this evil congregation”).²⁹

A possible relationship between Num 13-14 and Deut 1:19-46

From the above discussions we have seen Deut 1:19-46 shares or is dependent on part of the traditions of Num 13-14. We have also found some evidence that the Numeri version may have used the Deuteronomic version. There is two-way inter-dependence between them. In addition, the differences between Num 13-14 and Deut 1:19-46 are so great that a common source could not account for all the variants.

²⁹ For another detailed comparison of Num 13-14 and Deut 1:19-46, see Zion Zevit, “Converging Lines of Evidence Bearing on the Date of P,” *ZAW* 94 (1982): 481-511, especially 503-509.

We may propose that the Numeri version is formed by integration of the so-called “P” tradition and the non-P tradition which has used Deut 1. Certain parts were further redacted by later redactors. Part of Deut 1:19-46 must share the same traditions of Num 13-14. We may assume that Num 13-14 is based on Deut 1:19-46, but also on an older tradition which may also have been the *Vorlage* of the spy story of Deut 1.³⁰

After we have settled the relation between the Numeri version and the Deuteronomic version, we can compare the image of Moses in Num 13-14 with Deut 1:19-46:

About Moses	Num 13-14	Deut 1:19-46
Moses gives exhortation to the Israelites	Nil	vv. 20-21, 29-31
YHWH wants to make Moses into a nation	14:12 (non-P)	Nil
The intercessory prayer of Moses	14:13-19 (non-P)	Nil
Divine anger on Moses	Nil	v. 37
The punishment includes Moses	Nil	v. 37

For our present study, one of the contributions of Num 13-14 to Deut 1:19-46 is to show that the divine anger on Moses occurs in the Deuteronomic version, but not “P” or non-P of the Numeri version. One of the incompatibilities between Num 13-14 and Deut 1:19-46 is about the attitude of YHWH to Moses. In Numbers, the attitude of YHWH is so positive that He wants to make Moses into a nation greater and mightier than the Israelites (Num 14:12). In addition, YHWH has forgiven the Israelites according to the word of Moses (Num 14:20) after his intercessory prayer. Moses is not said to have committed any sin in Num 13-14. He was not excluded in

³⁰ Römer, “The Book of Deuteronomy,” 209.

Num 13-14. In Deut 1:37, Moses said that YHWH was angry with him and this was the reason for his exclusion from the Promised Land.

In addition, divine anger is absent in Num 13-14. This absence is atypical of its context. In Num 11-12 there are three incidents about the rebellion of the Israelites in the wilderness. Moses spoke for the people because YHWH was angry (Num 11:1, 10, 33; 12:9). However, there is no explicit mention that YHWH was angry in Num 13-14, nor any connection of divine anger with the exclusion of the Israelites and Moses. The only word for “anger” in Num 14:18 is in the expression “slow to anger,” a component of the so called “*hesed* formula”³¹ which emphasizes the mercy of YHWH rather than his anger. Deut 1:19-46 gives a different picture. This shows that Deuteronomy has given an original account although it has shared a common tradition of Num 13-14 as its *Vorlage*.

(3) Are Deut 1:37-38 later additions?

Before the attempt to interpret Deut 1:37, it is necessary to clarify its origin.

Some commentators consider Deut 1:37-38 not to be original to the narrative itself.³²

³¹ The “*hesed* formula” occurs in Ex 34:6; Num 14:18; Neh 9:17; Ps 86:15; 103:8; 145:8; Prov 14:29; Joel 2:13; Jon 4:2.

³² See von Rad, *Deuteronomy*, 40; Steuernagel, *Deuteronomium*, 6 (2d ed., 54-55) and others. Von Rad includes Deut 1:36 as a later addition on the ground that there is no precondition for the preferential treatment of Caleb. However, the prerequisite for the giving of the land to the second generation is also absent in Deut 1:19-40. On this ground, then, Deut 1:39 will be also counted as a later insertion. As a result, the verdict will only consist of Deut 1:35. However, such abrupt ending of the verdict cannot prepare the reader to understand that only the first generation had perished (Deut 2:14), and the second generation could enter the land (Deut 2:29). Therefore, Deut 1:39 should be retained as original. This shows that the absence of precondition for the preferential treatment cannot be the only reason for classification of an insertion. If the author of Deut 1:34-39 presupposes that the reader has known the traditions of Caleb in Num 13-14, then Deut 1:36 can be original.

For instance, August Dillmann points out that these two verses were inserted by the redactor of Deuteronomy because of three reasons. First, Deut 1:37-38 interrupt the flow of the context of 1:35-40.³³ In Chapter One of this dissertation, we have seen that Thomas W. Mann also has this view.³⁴ Second, the instruction to encourage Joshua in 1:38 occurs later in Deut 3:28 and 31:3-6.³⁵ Dillmann thinks that the purpose for adding 1:38 is to solve the problem that Joshua is not mentioned in verse 36.³⁶ Such missing of Joshua will lead to an impression that Joshua was also condemned with the first exodus generation. Third, Deut 1:39 connects well to 1:35-36, but not to 1:37-38.³⁷

For various reasons, however, Dillmann's view cannot be accepted. Firstly, although it seems that Deut 1:37-38 interrupts the divine saying, we also find the unity of Deut 1:35-40 as a whole because of the presence of Deut 1:37-38. Both interruption and *unity* are present in Deut 1:35-40. Interruption of the flow should not be the only criterion used for thinking that verses 37-38 are secondary. There is *unity* in the flow of divine saying as well. Such unity is best illustrated by the following structure of the verdict:

I. 1: 34-36 Contrast between The Israelites and Caleb

A 1:34 ...YHWH...was angry (קצף) ...

B 1:35... No one ... shall see (ראה) the good land...

³³ Dillmann, *Deuteronomium*, 239.

³⁴ Mann, "Theological Reflections," 482.

³⁵ Dillmann, *Deuteronomium*, 240.

³⁶ Dillmann, *Deuteronomium*, 240.

³⁷ Dillmann, *Deuteronomium*, 240.

C 1:36a ... except Caleb ... shall see (רָאָה) it...

D 1:36b ... because he has followed YHWH fully.

II. 1:37-38 Contrast between Moses and Joshua

A' 1:37a ...YHWH ...was angry (אַנִּי)...

B' 1:37b... you shall not enter (בִּיא) there.

C' 1:38a ... Joshua ... shall enter (בִּיא) there...

D' 1:38b ... because he will cause Israel to inherit it..

III. 1:39-40 Contrast between the second generation and the first generation

E 1:39... your little ones... shall enter there...

F 1:40... But as for you, turn around and set out for the wilderness...

All three sections give internal contrasts. Section I is parallel to section II. Both A and A' describe that YHWH was angry with an object. The anger of YHWH is related to the exclusion of the first exodus generation and Moses. Clauses B and B' indicate the first exodus generation and Moses shall not *see* or *enter* the land. C and C' indicate that Caleb and Joshua shall *see* and *enter* the land. B and C are about who “shall not” and “shall” *see* the land, while B' and C' are about who “shall not” and “shall” *enter* the land. Clauses D and D' explain that the reasons why Caleb and Joshua shall see and enter the land. The reasons are different. For Caleb, it is his personal faithfulness toward YHWH. He “wholly followed after YHWH,” that is, he

obeyed YHWH without reservation. Joshua's mission is to inherit the land with the people. In section III, the second generation shall enter the land but the first generation shall return by the way of the Reed Sea. From the above unity in structure of the verdict of YHWH, the content of Deut 1: 37-38 is not foreign to that of verses 34-36. In Deut 1:34-36, it is stated that the Israelites could not see the land, but Caleb could. A parallel can be found in verses 37-38 which state that Moses could not enter the land, but Joshua could. Both the Israelites and Moses were the objects of YHWH's anger as mentioned in verse 34 and verse 37.

Secondly, if the above well-balanced structure is read as original, and also as Caleb and Joshua are in parallel, there is no such problem of missing Joshua in Deut 1:36. Besides, the fact that the instruction to encourage Joshua occurs in Deut 3:28 does not exclude the possibility that this instruction has been given already in Deut 1:38. The instruction can repeat just as the mention of Moses' exclusion repeats.

Thirdly, Deut 1:39 can be read as a continuation of 1:37-38 because it helps to clarify the identity of the Israelites in verse 38, which says that Joshua will let "Israel" take possession. Since 1:35 has said that the Israelites could not see that land, then it may lead to a question of *who* will be the "Israel" in verse 38. Deut 1:39 can provide an answer: "the little ones," the second generation Israelites, is the "Israel" in verse 38. They will receive the land. Therefore, Deut 1:37-38 can be original and not a secondary addition.

(4) Was Moses innocent in the spy story (Deut 1:19-46)?

According to the result of the investigation of the expressions of divine anger in Deuteronomy in the Excursus of this chapter, twenty-one out of the twenty-seven occurrences of the wrath of God are due to human sin. Moses said that YHWH was angry with him on the people's account. Had Moses sinned in the spy incident? This section will argue that Moses was innocent in the spy story. Before we come to this conclusion, it is necessary to explain why other options are not preferable.

First, Moses did not make a wrong decision when he selected the spies (Deut 1:23). Moses action showed that Moses supported the suggestion of the people to send the spies. This suggestion of the people, however, would eventually lead to evil consequences.³⁸ However, this explanation is not convincing because Moses was not the only one who supported the people's proposal. All the spies supported the people's proposal. Caleb was also one of the spies and carried out the spy mission. This means that Caleb also agreed to the suggestion of the people just as Moses did. Hence, this does not explain why Caleb and Moses had different consequences, in fact both of them supported the proposal of the Israelites.

Neither is it possible to say that Moses was lazy. It has been suggested that Moses had not input enough force and energy to deliver to the people the order of attack.³⁹ It aroused the complaints of the people. Such an interpretation, however, cannot be sustained. According to the context of Deut 1:29-31, Moses had

³⁸ Perlitt, *Deuteronomium*, 119-120. Rose holds a similar opinion. See Rose, *Deuteronomium*, 485.

³⁹ Buis and Leclercq, *Deutéronome*, 40.

encouraged the people to fight. Moses' exhortation clearly directs the people to focus on YHWH, who had already fought for them in Egypt, rather than on their enemies (Deut 1:30). YHWH's company in the past can be a foundation for their faith. They need not fear (Deut 1:29). It is obvious that Moses had performed his duty as the leader of the Israelites.

If the context of Deut 1:19-46 does not provide sufficient information to deduce the sin of Moses, is it possible to use Deut 32:48-52 (or Num 20:1-13) to interpret the reason of divine wrath on Moses in Deut 1:37? Some commentators, for instance, the Jewish Rabbi Ramban thinks that Deut 1:37 alludes to the incident in Num 20:1-13. Ramban provides two explanations for the expression **בגללכם** ("on your account") in Deut 1:37. The first is that "the children of Israel strove with the Eternal and all this happened because of your quarrel." The second is "the expression for your sake may allude to the fact that... Moses and Aaron hit the rock in front of the people."⁴⁰ Hence, according to Ramban, Deut 1:37 refers to Num 20:1-13. Similarly, Rashi believes that different biblical texts can interpret each other, so he quotes Ps 106:32 to explain the term "for your sake" in Deut 3:26.⁴¹ He also thinks that the incident in Deut 3:26 is related to the waters of Meribah in Num 20:1-13. Thus, Moses was not sinful in the spy story but he *was* sinful in the waters of Meribah.⁴²

⁴⁰ Ramban (Nachmanides), *Commentary to the Torah: Deuteronomy* (trans. C. B. Chavel; New York: Shilo Publishing House, 1976), 22.

⁴¹ Rashi, *The Pentateuch and Rashi's commentary: Deuteronomy* (ed. A.B. Isaiah and B. Sharfman; New York: S & S R Publishing Company, 1949), 42.

⁴² John Calvin also removes Deut 1:37-38 from its context to make a connection with Num 20:1-13. This removal is possible because he thinks that the Deuteronomistic passage is not chronological. Quoted from George A. Smith, *Deuteronomy*, 22. McConville also says that it is not necessary to

This explanation must be rejected. First, this method withdraws Deut 1:37 from its context in Deut 1:19-46. The incident of the rock took place many years later. That Moses should suddenly mention incidents from so many years later while reviewing the incident of the spies would be odd.⁴³ Second, in Chapter Three of this dissertation, it was argued that Deut 32:48-52 was a later text than Deut 1-3. It is not legitimate to use a later text to interpret an earlier text. Third, it would be strange for Moses to refer to the incident three times in Deuteronomy as the Israelites' fault and ignore his own act entirely.⁴⁴

It would be wrong to suppose a "holistic" reading in this case. It has been pointed out that the combination of sources has yielded new meanings.⁴⁵ Deut 1:37 can be assumed to refer to Num 20:1-13. This changes the meaning of "on your account" in Deut 1:37. In the incident of waters of Meribah, Moses' sin was related to the people. This "holistic" reading may produce more than one meaning, it depends on which text is related. The above "holistic" reading requires the reader to relate the Deuteronomistic spy story to the incident of waters of Meribah in Numbers *only*. If a reader relates the Deuteronomistic spy story to the spy story in Numbers (Num 13-14) "holistically," then the "on your account" in Deut 1:37 would be interpreted in another way: Moses is also innocent according to the version of the spy

suppose that the incident in Num 20 is not in view because he thinks that Deuteronomy has compressed various events together. See McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 71. However, even if Deuteronomy is not chronological or it compressed events, it does not mean that Moses refers to the waters of Meribah in Deut 1:37.

⁴³ Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 425.

⁴⁴ Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 425.

⁴⁵ Propp, "Why Moses," 43, n. 19. Propp himself does not say that he agrees with this reading. He just quotes a possibility of a new reading: if one reads "holistically,"

story in Numbers. The problem of this “holistic” reading is that the Deuteronomic text itself does not ask the reader clearly to refer to any particular text.

Neither is it satisfactory to propose an “update of tradition” in Deut 1:37.

Recently, Eckart Otto explains the text Deut 1:19-46 under his scheme of the formation of the Pentateuch.⁴⁶ He reads Deut 1-3 in the perspective of the “post-Deuteronomistic” book of Numbers.⁴⁷ According to Otto, Deut 1:36-39 is later than other part of the spy story in Deut 1:19-46. He maintains that Deut 1:36-39 is an insertion of the post-exilic “updating of tradition” (*Fortschreibung*).⁴⁸ This post-exilic “updating of tradition” presupposes the knowledge of Num 20:12-13.⁴⁹ This presupposition can provide the ground to understand בַּגִּלְלָכֶם (“on your account”) in Deut 1:37.⁵⁰ In Num 20, the murmuring of the Israelites triggered Moses not to believe in YHWH. Therefore, Deut 1:37 is read in the light of Num 20:1-13.⁵¹ Such “updating of tradition,” however, is much too uncertain to gain support because there is no literary connection between Deut 1:37 and Num 20:11-13.⁵² When the incident of the waters of Meribah is mentioned in Num

⁴⁶ Otto states that during the period of Nehemiah, the Hexateuch was formed by the integration of the priestly source (P^G) with the priestly early post-exilic supplements (P^S) into the deuteronomistic work, and it contains Deut 1- Judg 2:9. According to Otto, the Pentateuch redaction occurred in the period of Ezra. The Pentateuch redactor separated the book of Joshua from the Pentateuch, inserted the book of covenant in Exodus, and ended it with Moses’ death (Deut 34). This redaction shifts the focus to the revelation at Sinai, while the gift of the land is pushed into the background. Otto thinks that some other passages of Leviticus and Numbers were added after the Pentateuchal redaction. The Pentateuch was finally closed during the end of the 4th century BCE. See Otto, “Pentateuch,” 9:688-9.

⁴⁷ Otto, *Deuteronomium* 1,1-4,43, 397.

⁴⁸ Otto, *Deuteronomium* 1,1-4,43, 395.

⁴⁹ Otto thinks that Deut 1:37 refers to Num 20:12-13, see Otto, *Deuteronomium* 1,1-4,43, 403.

⁵⁰ Otto, *Deuteronomium* 1,1-4,43, 397.

⁵¹ Otto, *Deuteronomium* 1,1-4,43, 397.

⁵² Veijola, *Deuteronomium*, 41.

27:13-14 and Deut 32:50-51, some elements are also mentioned. Such elements include: the name of the place (the waters of Meribah), the sin (not regarding YHWH as holy), and the usage of second person plural pronoun (“you” = Aaron and Moses). In Deut 1:37, none of these elements are mentioned. Besides, it is necessary to assume that the redactor of Deut 1-3 had the tradition of Num 20:1-13 in his mind when he updated the tradition. This assumption requires more solid foundations to be proven. Therefore, it is not necessary to read Deut 1:37 as a tradition which follows Num 20:1-13.

There is no evidence to support the view that Deut 1:37 is a “retrospective” reading. Some think that if the Israelites had trusted YHWH at Kadesh Barnea and entered the land under his command, the event recorded in Num 20 would never have occurred.⁵³ The people’s faithlessness precipitated a series of unfortunate events, including the story of water from the rock in Meribah. Moses was blaming the people for the anger of God. Moses’ complaint reflects his “bitterness.”⁵⁴ It can be argued that if the Israelite history is understood in light of such suggestion, the spy story itself is also one of the consequences of the previous events: the exodus (Exod 14). According to such logic: if God did not bring the Israelites out of Egypt, the spy story would never have occurred. Consequently, God has to bear some of the responsibility of the spy story. This way of interpretation is not satisfactory.

Is it possible that the tradition which talked about the sin of Moses was not

⁵³ Block, *Deuteronomy*, 73-74.

⁵⁴ Block, *Deuteronomy*, 131.

mentioned in Deut 1:19-46 for some reasons? Some say that Moses was not without fault and was not an innocent victim.⁵⁵ Moses omitted his own sin because the purpose of Moses' speech was to exhort the new generation not to go on failing as their parents had done.⁵⁶ However, such suggestion cannot explain why Moses omitted his fault *three times* in Deut 1-4.

There are not sufficient grounds to assert that Moses suffers *vicariously* for the people. There are scholars who think that Moses' punishment is a type of vicarious suffering.⁵⁷ They regard that Moses was like the servant of YHWH in Isaiah 53.⁵⁸ However, according to Isa 53:5, the chastisement of the servant will bring peace to the people. Besides, the people will be healed, and will not receive the punishment which they deserved. But in Deut 1:35 the first generation received the punishment they deserved. YHWH punished them according to their "wishes." Even after Moses was punished, they could not "escape" the punishment. Some scholars agree that Moses was innocent but they reject the interpretation of vicarious suffering because there is no notion of Moses as a "substitute."⁵⁹ Hence, there is no strong reason to suggest that Moses suffers vicariously for the people.

Finally, we come to the most persuasive option. The suggestion that Moses was

⁵⁵ Christopher J. H. Wright, *Deuteronomy*, 42.

⁵⁶ Christopher J. H. Wright, *Deuteronomy*, 42.

⁵⁷ Hubert Cunliffe-Jones, *Deuteronomy* (New York: Macmillan, 1951), 43; G. Ernest Wright, "Deuteronomy," 526; A. Phillips, *Deuteronomy*, 19; Cairns, *Deuteronomy*, 38. Levinson, "Deuteronomy," 365.

⁵⁸ Cairns, *Deuteronomy*, 38; Moran, "Deuteronomy," 261; Nielsen, *Deuteronomium*, 53.

⁵⁹ Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 147; Thomas W. Mann, "Denial," 486-487; Veijola, *Deuteronomium*, 93.

punished because he was the *leader* of the people is probably essentially correct.⁶⁰

The term **בגללכם** is understood in the way that being a leader of the people,⁶¹

Moses had to bear the responsibility for the consequences of the sin of the people.⁶²

We have seen that there are parallels between Deut 1:34-35 and 1:37 in the structure of the verdict. Both parts involve the wrath of God. In addition, both are contrasted

by the verses which follow them. The first generation is contrasted by Caleb, while

Moses is contrasted by Joshua. Moreover, the punishments are similar: not allowing

to “see” the land and not allowing to “enter” the land. These parallels signify Moses

can be compared to the **איש** (“man”) in Deut 1:35. As the leader of all the people,

Moses was not permitted to enter the land just as the **איש** was the leader of his family,

and they would not see the good land.⁶³ It is therefore likely that although Moses

was innocent, the role of leader was the cause for him to bear the anger of God with

⁶⁰ Christensen, *Deuteronomy 1-11*, 31; Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 105; Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 147; Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 56; Smith, *Deuteronomy*, 25; Veijola, *Deuteronomium*, 41, 92.

⁶¹ The particle **בגלל**, meaning “because of” or “on account of,” occurs ten times in the Hebrew Bible. See *HALOT* 1:149; *DCH* 2:93. The table below shows that the particle **בגלל** is used in connection with blessing or bringing disaster to others.

	Blessing	Bringing Disaster
An individual (or a small number of people) influences a community	Gen 39:5	1 Kgs 14:16 Jer 15:4 Mic 3:12
The amount is not different	Gen 12:13 Gen 30:27 Deut 15:10	Deut 18:12 Jer 11:17
A community influences an individual		Deut 1:37

In four out of the ten instances, the community is influenced because of the deed or presence of a small number of people: the family of Potiphar is blessed by God because of Joseph (Gen 39:5); YHWH will give up the Israelites because of the sins of Jeroboam (1 Kgs 14:16); the people will be punished because of the deeds of Manasseh (Jer 15:4); Zion and Jerusalem will be destroyed because of the bad leaders, priests and prophets in the city (Mic 3:12). In five out of the ten instances, the number of the people who are influenced, is not greatly different from the other one. The case of an individual (Moses) influenced by the community occurs only in Deut 1:37. Consequently, it is a unique case.

⁶² Christensen, *Deuteronomy*, 32; Veijola, *Deuteronomium*, 41, 93.

⁶³ Rose, *Deuteronomium*, 485.

the people.

But to say this is not to include the possibility that Moses is compared to the other leader, king Josiah. According to some interpreters, the innocent fate of Moses may echo the undeserved death of the righteous king Josiah (2 Kgs 23:25-27).⁶⁴ However, there is a great difference between Moses and king Josiah, and it would be unwise to equalise them. According to 2 Kgs 22:20, king Josiah was distinguished from the people. The people would face the *disaster*, but king Josiah would not see it, and he would be gathered to his grave in *peace*. The juxtaposition of “peace” and “disaster” is a contrast between Josiah and the people. Such contrast does not occur between Moses and the Israelites because Moses should bear a similar punishment with his people.

Norbert Lohfink may be right in the point that the readers of Deut 1:19-46 were the people in exile.⁶⁵ Moses’ exclusion can be compared to the second generation in exile.⁶⁶ The purpose of the narrative is the “readers’ identification with Moses.”⁶⁷ There was a progression for the reader to identify themselves with Moses: First, to feel how a spark of hope kindled in Moses when all the first exodus generation had died, and Moses was still alive; second, to sense how the hope grew when Moses even received the divine command to begin the occupation of the land; third, to share with Moses the “dark act of obedience” by which Moses pronounced publicly Joshua

⁶⁴ Braulik, *Deuteronomium 1-16,17*, 28; Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 56.

⁶⁵ Lohfink, “Individual and Community,” 230.

⁶⁶ Deut 1-4* were written during the time of the second generation of the Babylonian exile.

⁶⁷ Lohfink, “Individual and Community,” 232.

as his successor; fourth, to learn from Moses how one should say “yes” to the divine will, even in such difficult matters; fifth and finally, the identification with Moses is complete when Moses stands as a “supplicant” before God.⁶⁸ The second exile generation was innocent, just as Moses was innocent. The author wanted to persuade the people in exile to abandon individualistic ideas of personal guilt or innocence, and simply to feel themselves united with the great and total guilt of the nation.⁶⁹ When the second exile generation lived in exile, it seemed that God was angry with them. The second exile generation had experienced divine anger *because of their fathers*, just as Moses said that God was angry with him *because of the first generation*.

To summarise: in the context of Deut 1:19-46, Moses was not sinful. Out of the context of Deut 1:19-46, there are no other texts which explain the fault of Moses in the spy story. It is not necessary to deduce that Moses alluded to the incident of the waters of Meribah when he said that YHWH was angry with him because of the people. Moses was innocent, and he did not suffer vicariously. As a leader, he suffered with the people.

(5) Is the verdict operated according to the principle of corporate responsibility?

The phrase “on your account” follows the mention of divine anger in the

⁶⁸ Lohfink, “Individual and Community,” 231-232.

⁶⁹ Lohfink, “Individual and Community,” 230-231.

exclusion of Moses. Such phrase has become a component of the reason for the exclusion of Moses. Moses should receive the penalty of the disobedient Israelites.⁷⁰ Being as a member and a leader of them, he should bear the responsibility for the unfaithfulness of the people. It seems that “corporate responsibility” is the principle behind the punishment of Moses. Is the whole verdict also operated by such principle? We will examine each unit in the verdict one by one.

(a) The first exodus generation

YHWH was angry with the first generation and punished them not to receive the land. They were called “evil,” which was a great contrast to the land which was “good.” What was the sin of the first generation? How evil were they? According to Deut 1:32, Moses said that they did not trust in YHWH. What is the meaning of not trusting in YHWH? The context of the narrative itself can provide the answer to this question.

From their experience, they should know that YHWH has gone before them to seek suitable resting places, and to show them the right way, in fire by night and in cloud by day (Deut 1:33). In addition, they should also know that YHWH will fight for them just as He did in Egypt (Deut 1:30). Furthermore, they had heard the command of YHWH that they have to go in and take possession of the land (Deut

⁷⁰ Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 27; Mann, “Theological Reflections,” 490-491; Judah Goldin, “The Death of Moses: An Exercise in Midrashic Transposition,” in *Love and Death in the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of Marvin H. Pope* (ed. R. M. Good and J. H. Marks. Guilford, Conn.: Four Quarters, 1987), 219.

1:8). However, they thought that YHWH hated them, and would give them to the Amorites to destroy them (Deut 1:27). Thus, it is fair to say that the Israelites did not believe in YHWH's word, His power to fight and His care for them. The punishment on the first generation was because of their own evil and of their failure in believing in YHWH. Hence, the principle behind the punishment is *individual* responsibility.

(b) Caleb and his descendants

Why could Caleb see the land?⁷¹ First, Caleb was not the leader of the Israelites, he did not have the same role as Moses. Second, according to Deut 1:36, the reason is that Caleb was מלא אחרֵי יְהוָה “completely followed YHWH,” literally means “he completely filled himself after YHWH.”⁷² The literary meaning gives some sense of the total obedience of Caleb.⁷³ This phrase occurs eight times in the Hebrew Bible, six of them are applied to Caleb related to the spy story.⁷⁴

⁷¹ Some scholars claim that Caleb was referred here because the Deuteronomist wanted to provide a background for later material in the Deuteronomistic History. See Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 132; Noth, *Pentateuchal Traditions*, 132-33. For recent discussions of Caleb, see Dennis T. Olson, “Caleb (Hebrew Bible/ Old Testament),” *EBR* 4:779-81; Jacob L. Wright, *David, King of Israel, and Caleb in Biblical Memory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

⁷² Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 104. George Smith points out that in Deut 1:36 since YHWH is the speaker, the reader may expect “after me” rather than “after YHWH” as in Num 14:24. Smith then suggests that the original text in Deut 1:36 was מלא אחרֵי (“after me”), the last letter of which has been mistaken by a scribe for the initial of YHWH. See Smith, *Deuteronomy*, 24.

⁷³ Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 105.

⁷⁴ Num 14:24; 32:12; Deut 1:36; Josh 14:8, 9, 14. In Num 14:30, YHWH said that Joshua could enter the land but did not give any reason. Joshua is not described as “completely following YHWH” in Num 13-14. In Num 32:12, however, both Caleb and Joshua could see the land because “they” completely follow YHWH. Joshua is also depicted as “completely following YHWH” in Num 32. This indicates that the phrase “completely follow YHWH” has become a *generalized reason* to qualify who can see/ enter the land. In Num 14, the Israelites have never been described as “not completely following YHWH” although they have different types of faults. In Num 14:11, they spurn YHWH and do not believe in Him; in Num 14:22, they have tested YHWH and did not listen to YHWH; in Num 14:27, they have grumbled against YHWH. In Num 32:8-13 they are qualified as “not completely following YHWH” (Num 32:11). The expression “not completely follow YHWH” picks up the expression used in a positive form in relation to Caleb in Num 14:24 and reverses it. The

How can we know that Caleb had a total obedience to YHWH? In Deuteronomy, the first mention of Caleb is in Deut 1:36. If we only rely on Deut 1, we are not sure that Caleb was one of the spies. We do not know he had been to Hebron. And when YHWH said that he would give the land on which Caleb set foot (Deut 1:36), we do not know what land Caleb would receive. Deut 1:36 is intelligible only in the literary context of Num 13-14.⁷⁵ The author of Deut 1:36 should know the traditions about Caleb in Num 13-14.⁷⁶ The presupposed knowledge about Caleb in the Numeri version would make the Deuteronomy version more understandable. According to Num 13:6, Caleb was one of the twelve spies. In Num 13:30 Caleb encouraged the people to go up and take possession of the land. He tore his clothes after the people said that they would appoint a leader and return to Egypt (Num 14:6). In Num 14:7-9, he encouraged the people not to be afraid. According to his message, he had mentioned YHWH three times. First, the condition for receiving the land is in YHWH (Num 14:8). Second, do not rebel against YHWH (Num 14:9a). Third, YHWH is with them, so the people of the land will be the prey of the Israelites (Num 14:9b). In such a short message, he focused on YHWH three times and saw YHWH as the sole vital factor for receiving the land. Caleb was the only one who had the courage to attack the strong city with its giant inhabitants.⁷⁷ Hence, it is fair to say

reason why Caleb can see the land “has been reversed into negative form to become the reason why the people will not see the land.” See Suzanne Boorer, *The Promise of the Land as Oath: A Key to the Formation of the Pentateuch* (BZAW 205; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1992), 421.

⁷⁵ Otto, *Deuteronomium* 1,1-4,43, 397.

⁷⁶ Perlitt, *Deuteronomium*, 117.

⁷⁷ Noth, *Pentateuchal Traditions*, 132.

that he had a great loyalty to YHWH. The gift of the land to Caleb was a reward for his loyalty and obedience.⁷⁸ Since Caleb could receive the gift of the land according to his own obedience and loyalty, the principle behind the reward is *individual* reward.

Why could the descendants of Caleb receive the land as well? Deut 1:36b may be used to prepare the reader to read Josh 14:6-15 because there are close links between Deut 1:36 and Josh 14:6-15.⁷⁹ Martin Noth notes that the descendants of Caleb are mentioned with Caleb at the same time, so the fact that the land as gift to Caleb is not a personal fortune of the single person Caleb, his sons were also affected.⁸⁰ They had not done anything. They could receive the gift just because they were the sons of Caleb. Hence, they were benefited by the merit of Caleb, not by their own merit. The principle behind this reward is *corporate* responsibility.

(c) Joshua and the second exodus generation

Why could Joshua enter the land? According to Deut 1:38, he would make the Israelites possess the land. He was given a mission by YHWH. He would be the successor of Moses because Moses could not enter the land. The reward of Joshua is according to his own mission, so it is the principle of *individual* responsibility.

⁷⁸ Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972. Repr., Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1992), 78.

⁷⁹ For instance, the relative clause “that he sets foot on her [= the land]” (Deut 1:36b) refers to “the land on which your foot trod” in Josh 14:9a, rather than the clause in Num 14:24 “that he went to there.” See Perlitt, *Deuteronomium*, 117-8.

⁸⁰ Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 133.

The second generation had not done anything. They were called not knowing “good or evil,” which is a contrast to their parents who were called “evil.” The main reason that they could receive the land is that YHWH wanted to transform the words of the first generation. According to Num 14:3 the first generation Israelites said that their wives and their little ones would become booty. In Deut 1:39, YHWH specially mentions that the second generation “whom you [= the Israelites] said would become booty.” Therefore, it is not because of their own merit that the second generation can receive the land, but because of the words of their parents. Consequently, the principle behind this reward is *corporate* responsibility.

(d) The co-existence of both principles

The idea that a righteous one suffers with the unrighteous can also be applied to Caleb, Joshua and the second exodus generation. They could not enter the Promised land *immediately* after the spy incident but *only after thirty-eight years*. They were also innocent but have to wander in the wilderness. Moses was not the only one who suffered with the people. Therefore, in the case of Caleb and Joshua, they were rewarded according to the principle of individual responsibility, but the actualization of their rewards was delayed according to the principle of *corporate* responsibility.

In sum we can see *both* the concepts of “individual responsibility” and “corporate responsibility” in this passage. We can find that the principle of

“corporate responsibility” applies to both the blessing and the punishment. In the case of blessing, Caleb’s sons could receive the land not because of their faithfulness, but because of that of their father Caleb. The second exodus generation also could receive the land not because of their own merit. In the case of punishment, Caleb, Joshua and the second exodus generation were also punished although they were rewarded with the gift of the land. They could not enter the Promised Land immediately after the spy incident but only after thirty-eight years. They were also innocent but have to wander in the wilderness. Moses was not the only one who suffered with the people. This coexistence of “individual responsibility” and “corporate responsibility” suggests that it is difficult to apply only one principle to the reality.

2. Divine response to Moses’ prayer in Deut 3

Our second passage about divine anger on Moses is Deut 3:26-27 which is in the context of Deut 3:23-28.

In the broader context of Deut 3:18-28 Moses first spoke to the second generation of the two and a half tribes, and then to Joshua, and finally Moses himself prayed to YHWH.⁸¹ The common theme of the sayings is about *crossing the Jordan*. After Moses had given the land to the Reubenites, the Gadites and the half-tribe of

⁸¹ In Deut 1:37-39, the order is: Moses, Joshua and the second generation. The order is exactly reversed. See W. L. Moran, “Deuteronomy,” in *A New Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture* (ed. R. C. Fuller, L. Johnston and C. Kearns; 2d ed.; London: Nelson, 1975), 263.

Manasseh (Deut 3:12-17), he commanded these two and a half tribes that they should cross over and arm before their brothers (Deut 3:18-20). Then Moses said to Joshua, “...so YHWH shall do to all the kingdoms into which you are about to cross” (Deut 3:21-22). Moses also prayed that he could cross over the Jordan to see the good land. But YHWH commanded Moses to go up to the top of Pisgah to see the land rather than crossing over the Jordan (Deut 3:23-28). This is the second mention of the exclusion of Moses in Deuteronomy.

For our present study there are two main issues on the exclusion of Moses in Deut 3:26-27. First, in Deut 1:37 and 4:21, the verb **אָנַף** is used for the divine anger on Moses, while in Deut 3:26, **עָבַר** is used. Why is a different verb used in Deut 3:26? Second, how can we understand **לְמַעַנְכֶם** (“for your sake”) in the context of Deut 3:26-27?

In Deut 3:26, the Hitpael of the verb **עָבַר** is used to express YHWH’s anger. Many commentators point out that **עָבַר** is a strong word,⁸² and is stronger than **אָנַף**.⁸³ The verb **עָבַר**, meaning “to be angry”⁸⁴ or “to be furious,”⁸⁵ occurs eight times in the Hebrew Bible, all are in the Hitpael stem.⁸⁶ Of the eight occurrences, five of them were used with divine subject. Such usage of the verb **עָבַר** with divine subject is shown in the following table:⁸⁷

⁸² Bertholet, *Deuteronomium*, 13; Cairns, *Deuteronomy*, 50-51; Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 127; Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 227; Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 147.

⁸³ Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 60; Smith, *Deuteronomy*, 55.

⁸⁴ HALOT 1:781.

⁸⁵ DCH 6:242.

⁸⁶ Deut 3:26; Ps 78:21, 59, 62; 89:39 (Eng = 89:38); Pro 14:16; 20:2; 26:17.

⁸⁷ The other three texts in the Proverbs (Prov 14:16; 20:2 and 26:17) are not used with divine subject,

	Stem of עבר	Preposit- ion	Object of the verb	Reason for anger	Consequence of anger
Deut 3:26	Hitpael	with (ב)	“me” = Moses	Moses prayed to YHWH with an inappropriate request and “for your sake” (למענכם)	YHWH did not listen to Moses
Ps 78:21	Hitpael	---	---	YHWH heard the complaints and doubt of the Israelites (Ps 78:19-20)	A fire was kindled against Jacob; and anger also mounted against Israel
Ps 78:59	Hitpael	---	---	God heard the apostasy of the Israelites (Ps 78:56-58)	YHWH greatly rejected Israel
Ps 78:62	Hitpael	with (ב)	“His possess- ion” = Israelites	God heard the apostasy of the Israelites (Ps 78:56-58)	YHWH delivered His people to the sword and more people died in Ps 78:63-64
Ps 89:39	Hitpael	with (עם)	“your anointed” = King of Israel	--- (Not clear in the context of Ps 89)	YHWH cast off and rejected the king

In these five texts, the verb occurs with the preposition ב (“with” in Deut 3:26 and Ps 78:62) and עם (“with” in Ps 89:39). In Ps 78:59 and 89:39, the consequences are similar: someone is rejected by YHWH. The above comparison above can be used to know that this verb is used in the context of a rejection. In Deut 3:36, Moses is also rejected by YHWH, who does not listen to Moses’ prayer.

There are two reasons for the divine wrath in Deut 3:26: Firstly, it is the prayer of Moses. In Deut 3:25, he prayed to God let him go over and see the good land. Some argue that YHWH’s anger in Deut 3:26 is merely a response to Moses’ prayer in 3:25.⁸⁸ It is possible because in Deut 3:26, YHWH speaks to Moses, “It is enough for you. Do not continue to speak to me of this matter again.” It seems that YHWH

and they are not discussed here.

⁸⁸ Bertholet, *Deuteronomium*, 13; Perlitt, *Deuteronomium*, 273; Veijola, *Deuteronomium*, 92.

speaks this words angrily. YHWH was angry with Moses because Moses prayed to Him with the content which YHWH did not like at that moment. It is possible that the verb וַיִּתְעַבֵּר (“And he was very angry”) is used as a kind of “word play” with the verb אֶעְבְּרָה (“I cross”) Moses used in the prayer in 3:25.⁸⁹

The second reason for the divine wrath in Deut 3:26 is that לְמַעַנְכֶם (“for your sake”) is mentioned by Moses. The preposition לְמַעַן, meaning “for the sake of”⁹⁰ occurs 272 times in the Hebrew Bible. There are a few ways to understand the function of “for your sake” here in Deut 3:26. First, it has been suggested that לְמַעַנְכֶם is a “gloss” after the influence of Deut 1:37 and 4:21,⁹¹ that is, it is a later insertion. Such argument is based on the context of Deut 3:26-27 in which YHWH is furious with Moses just after his prayer to Him, not because of anything of the people. The prayer is the main cause for divine anger. Second, if one reads Deut 3 after Deut 1, the “for your sake” in Deut 3:26 is related to the “on your account” in Deut 1:37. Moses was punished because of the sin of the people. Moses felt the anger of God again after he heard that YHWH refused his request. God refused Moses because the sin of the first generation was so great that the punishment which had been pronounced should be carried out, and his prayer could not be listened to.⁹²

⁸⁹ Bertholet, *Deuteronomium*, 13; Christensen, *Deuteronomy*, 69; Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 60; Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 227; Perlitt, *Deuteronomium*, 273.

⁹⁰ HALOT 1:614.

⁹¹ Bertholet, *Deuteronomium*, 13.

⁹² The other way to read the expression is that, according to Lohfink, different prepositions are used in order to express different meanings. In Deut 1:37, the term בְּגַלְלַכֶּם represents “because of the past behavior of the generation of the people.” In Deut 3:26, the term לְמַעַנְכֶם represents “because of the future of the people.” Norbert Lohfink, “Narrative Analyse von Dtn 1,6-3,29,” in Norbert Lohfink, *Studien zum Deuteronomium und zur deuteronomistischen Literatur V* (SBA 38; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2005), 103. However, according to the context of Deut 3:18-20, the “you” is

Therefore, the divine anger in Deut 3:26 is different from that of 1:37. In the first place, the reasons are different: in 1:37, Moses had not done anything wrong to irritate YHWH, while in 3:26, Moses irritated YHWH with his prayer. Secondly, the sayings of YHWH are different: in 1:37, YHWH said that Moses should not enter the land, while in 3:26 YHWH said that Moses should not ask again that he wanted to cross over the Jordan.

In Deut 3:27, the exclusion of Moses is mentioned only *after* YHWH has commanded Moses to go up to the top of Pisgah. The purpose of this command is to let Moses see the land. The exclusion of Moses is mentioned just because it explains the limitation of Moses. Since Moses could not cross the Jordan, he had to go up the mountain in order to see the land. In Deut 3:25, Moses asked YHWH to let him see the good land. In Deut 3:27, YHWH permitted Moses to see the land from the top of Pisgah. To a certain extent, YHWH has answered Moses' request (even in His anger)!

Summary

In the context of Deut 3:23-28, YHWH was angry with Moses because Moses irritated YHWH with his prayer. Moses felt the anger of YHWH because he heard that God told him not to ask for entering the land again. However Moses was not

“the two and a half tribes.” In Deut 3:20, Moses told the “you” that they can return to the land which Moses had given to them after their brothers occupied the land beyond the Jordan. The “you” in Deut 3:26 can be “the two and a half tribes” or “all the people of Israel” if we think that Moses has changed his audience from “the two and a half tribes” to all the Israelites. However, even if the “you” is the second generation, it does not point to the “future” of the generation.

punished after this divine anger. He was not permitted to pray that request again. The exclusion of Moses is not directly related to divine anger in Deut 3:26. The term “for your sake” is used to clarify that Moses did not sin, and to illustrate that the sin of the first exodus generation was very great.

3. An Excursus: Reasons for divine anger in Deuteronomy

The first chapter of this dissertation has noted that in Deut 1:37 and 4:21, the verb **אָנַף** is used, while in Deut 3:26, the verb **עָבַר** is used. In fact, we may find two more different verbs of divine anger in the context of Deut 1-4: **קִצַּף** (Deut 1:34) and **כָּעַס** (Deut 4:25). In the Book of Deuteronomy, “divine anger” is expressed by different words and if used as a verb, in different stems. The following table shows the distribution, the form, and the stem of the words of “divine anger” in Deuteronomy.

The vocabulary for divine anger in Deuteronomy

Deut	אָנַף (v)	אָף (n)	חָמָה (n)	חָרָה (v)	חָרוֹן (n)	חָרִי (n)	כָּעַס (v)	כָּעַס (n)	עָבַר (v)	קָצַף (v)	קָצַף (n)
1:34										Qal	
1:37	Hitp										
3:26									Hitp		
4:21	Hitp										
4:25							Hif				
6:15		n		Qal							
7:4		n		Qal							
9:7										Hif	
9:8	Hitp									Hif	
9:18							Hif				
9:19		n	n							Qal	
9:20	Hitp										
9:22										Hif	
11:17		n		Qal							
13:18		n			n						
29:19		n									
29:22		n	n								
29:23		n				n					
29:26		n		Qal							
29:27		n	n								n
31:17		n		Qal							
31:29							Hif				
32:16							Hif				
32:19								n			
32:21							Piel				
32:22		n									
32:27								n			

Key : “Hif” = Hiphil; “Hitp”= Hitpacl; “Piel” = Piel; “Qal” = Qal; “n” = noun.

We will discuss the usage of the different terms of divine anger in turn.

(1) The verb **אָנַף**

The verb **אָנַף**, meaning “to be angry,”⁹³ occurs four times in the book of Deuteronomy (Deut 1:37; 4:21; 9:8, 20), but is absent in the Tetrateuch. Of these all of them are in the Hitpael stem, and are always used with God as its subject. This verb is a denominative verb, referring to the dilation of the nostril in anger.⁹⁴ The usage of the verb **אָנַף** in Deuteronomy is shown in the following table:

Deut	Preposition	Object of the verb	Reason for divine anger	Consequence of divine anger
1:37	with (ב)	“me” = Moses	“on your [the Israelites] account” (בגללכם)	YHWH forbade Moses to enter the Promised Land
4:21	with (ב)	“me” = Moses	“because of your [the Israelites’] words” (על דבריכם)	YHWH forbade Moses to cross the Jordan
9:8	with (ב)	“you” = the Israelites	the Israelites had made an image of a calf (Deut 9:12, 16)	YHWH would destroy the Israelites
9:20	with (ב)	Aaron	the Israelites had made an image of a calf (Deut 9:12, 16)	YHWH would destroy Aaron

In these texts, the verb **אָנַף** often occurs with the preposition **ב** (“with”), which indicates the object of divine anger. In Deut 1:37 the reason for divine anger is בגללכם (“on your [=the Israelites] account”), while in Deut 4:21, it is על דבריכם (“because of your [=the Israelites’] words”). The expression על דבריכם occurs only once in the Hebrew Bible. If one believes this term is the same as בגללכם (1:37) and למענכם (3:26) in the parallel texts, one may think that על דבריכם means “for your sake.”⁹⁵ However, it is also possible that the editor uses

⁹³ HALOT 1:72.

⁹⁴ John Gray, *I and II Kings* (2d ed. OTL; London: SCM, 1970), 227.

⁹⁵ Bertholet, *Deuteronomium*, 17.

the term **על דבריכם** to allude to the “murmurings” of the Israelites in the spy story when they received the report of the spies.⁹⁶ It is because, according to Deut 1:34, YHWH heard the voice of “your [= the Israelites’] words.” Thus, **על דבריכם** is an “explanatory interpretation” of **בגללכם** in Deut 1:37,⁹⁷ and the “words” of “because of your words” refer to the “murmurings” of the people in the spy story.⁹⁸ The consequence of divine anger in Deut 1:37 and 4:21 is the exclusion of Moses from the Promised Land. According to the context of Deut 9, the reason for divine anger is that the Israelites had made an image of a calf (Deut 9:12, 16). The punishment is that YHWH will destroy (**שמר**) the Israelites (Deut 9:8) and Aaron (Deut 9:20). The verb **אנף** does not relate to a certain type of sin, and the punishment caused by such divine anger is not fixed.

(2) The group **אף** with combination of other terms

(a) The combination of **אף** with **חרה**

The combination of **אף** with the verb **חרה** occurs five times in Deuteronomy. Of these the noun **אף** is associated directly with YHWH in Deut 6:15; 7:4; 11:17; 29:26 (27 ET).

The combination of אף with חרה	Deut
יחרה אף יהוה	6:15
וחרה אף יהוה	7:4
וחרה אף יהוה	11:17
ויחר אף יהוה	29:26

⁹⁶ Veijola, *Deuteronomium*, 114.

⁹⁷ Perlitt, *Deuteronomium*, 336-337.

⁹⁸ Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 244; Perlitt, *Deuteronomium*, 336-337.

In Deut 31:17 אֵפִי is used instead. According to the context, it is YHWH who is speaking. Therefore, אֵפִי (“my anger”) is also YHWH’s anger. In these five cases the anger of YHWH is the subject of the verb חָרָה which is always in the Qal stem.

Although one of the meanings of אָף can be “nose,” and the clause יַחֲרֶה אָף יְהוָה can literally mean “the nose of YHWH would become hot,” it should be translated as “YHWH’s anger would be kindled.” Cornelis Houtmann explains the connection between “nose” and “anger” in this way: the nose is the organ used in breathing; when the breathing becomes more rapid and turns into snorting, this is the body’s way of saying that it is filled with rage.⁹⁹ In some passages the nose plays a certain role in the description of anger.¹⁰⁰

According to the context of the above passages, the cause of divine anger is apostasy. “Following other gods” (Deut 6:14), “serving other gods” (Deut 7:4; 11:16; 29:25 [26 ET]), “worshiping other gods” (Deut 11:16; 29:25 [26 ET]), and “prostituting themselves to the foreign gods, forsaking YHWH, breaking the covenant which YHWH has made with them” are the sins which will give rise to the burning of YHWH’s anger. The punishments related to such anger are “destruction of the people” (Deut 6:15; 7:4; 11:17). In addition, YHWH would bring the curses on the land (Deut 29:26 [27 ET]), and forsake the people (Deut 31:17). The usage of the combination of אָף with the verb חָרָה is quite consistent in that it relates to the sin of

⁹⁹ Cornelis Houtmann, *Exodus Vol.1* (trans. J. Rebel and S. Woudstra; Kampen: Kok Publishing House, 1993), 415.

¹⁰⁰ For instance, Ezek 38:18; Ps 18:8-9. See E. Johnson, “אָף,” *TDOT* 1:351.

apostasy and the punishments are very destructive.

(b) The combination of **אף** with **חמה**

There are three occurrences of the combination of **אף** with **חמה** in the book of Deuteronomy (9:19; 29:22[23 ET], 27[28 ET]). They are constructed in the following three ways. In Deut 9:19 **והחמה פני האף** (“the faces of the anger and rage”) is the object of the verb **יגרתני** (“I was afraid”). Both **אף** and **חמה** are used to qualify **פני** (“the faces,” in construct form). In the context Moses was afraid that the wrath of YHWH, which was caused by all the sins the people had committed, would destroy the people.

In Deut 29:22 (23 ET) **באפו ובחמתו** (“in His anger and in His rage”) are used as two adverbial prepositional phrases qualifying the main verb **הפך** (“turn,” Qal). In this context “His” anger is YHWH’s anger because YHWH is the antecedent of the third person masculine pronominal suffix. In this context YHWH had “turned” Sodom, Gormoral, Admah and Zeboiim in His anger and rage. The cause of such anger is not clearly stated, but the effect is very clear, it is destruction.

In Deut 29:27 (28 ET) **באף ובחמה ובקצף** (“in anger, in rage, and in wrath”) are used as three adverbial prepositional phrases describing the “pulling out” (**ויתשם** “and he pulled out,” Qal) and “throwing” (**וישלכם** “and he cast/ threw,” Hiphil) actions of YHWH. This is the punishment for the Israelites because they abandoned the covenant which YHWH made with them. They turned, served and worshipped

other gods (Deut 29:24-25[25-26 ET]). The combination of אף with חמה does not relate to a certain type of sin or a fixed punishment.

(c) The noun אף used with other terms

(i) אף is used with חרון

אף is used with חרון only once in Deuteronomy (Deut 13:18). In the construction of מחרון אפו (“from the wrath of His anger”), אפו (“His anger”) is used to qualify חרון (“wrath,” in construct form). The prepositional phrase as a whole is used to modify the main verb ישוב (“He may turn,” Qal), that is, YHWH may turn from the wrath of His anger. It can be noted that the expressions of divine anger are more common in Deut 1-11 and 29-32, which is the “frame” of the Deuteronomic law (12-26). The only one in Deut 12-26 is Deut 13:18, which says that YHWH may turn from his anger and show the people compassion if they do not let anything devoted to destruction stick to their hands. The combination of אף with חרון in this case does not relate to any sin and punishment.

(ii) אף is used with עשן

The combination of אף with the verb עשן is used only once in Deuteronomy (Deut 29:19 [20 ET]). According to the construction יהוה אף יעשן וקנאתו, both אף יהוה (“anger of YHWH”) and קנאתו (“His jealousy/ zeal”) are the subjects of the verb יעשן (“will burn,” Qal). The cause of such divine anger is that someone of

the Israelites believed that he was safe even though he had gone his own stubborn ways after he had heard the words of the curses (Deut 29:18 [19 ET]). The punishment is that God would single him out from all the tribes of Israel and bring all the curses of the covenant to him (Deut 29:20 [21 ET]).

(iii) חרי is used with אף

The combination of אף with חרי is used only once in Deuteronomy (Deut 29:23 [24 ET]). In the construction חרי האף, חרי and אף are in a genitive relationship. חרי האף (“the anger”) is used to qualify חרי (“burning of,” in construct form). חרי האף as a whole is modified by הגדול הזה (“this great”). That great burning anger is used to describe the action of YHWH done on the land according to the context of Deut 29:22 (23ET) in which four cities were “turned” by YHWH in His anger.

(iv) אף is used with קרח

The combination of אף with the verb קרח is used only once in Deuteronomy (Deut 32:22). In the construction אש קרחה באפי, the noun אש (“fire”) is the subject of the main verb קרח (“be kindled,” Qal). The prepositional phrase באפי (“in My anger”) is used to modify the verb קרח. The fire is kindled in anger because YHWH punishes the people by the way of “measure for measure.” In the context of Deut 32:21, the Israelites made YHWH jealous with what is no god, and provoked Him with the idols. Therefore, YHWH would make them jealous with what is no people,

and provoke them with a foolish nation.

(3) The group כַּעַס

(a) The noun כַּעַס

The noun כַּעַס occurs two times in Deuteronomy, both are found in the Song of Moses (Deut 32). In Deut 32:19 the noun כַּעַס occurs in a prepositional phrase מִכַּעַס בָּנָיו וּבָנֹתָיו, and is in a genitive relationship with בָּנָיו וּבָנֹתָיו (“His sons and His Daughters”). בָּנָיו וּבָנֹתָיו is used to qualify כַּעַס, that is, to describe the *origin* of the provocation. So the source of YHWH’s provocation is from His people.

According to Deut 32:16-18, the sin of the people is their apostasy. They sacrificed to demons and gods they did not know. They forgot the God who gave them birth.

The prepositional phrase מִכַּעַס בָּנָיו וּבָנֹתָיו as a whole is used to modify the verb

וַיִּנְאֹץ (“and He spurned”). If the preposition מִן means “because,” then the

prepositional phrase explains why YHWH spurned the Israelites. The rejection of

YHWH to His people is the punishment for their sin of apostasy.

The construction in Deut 32:27 is כַּעַס אוֹיֵב. The noun כַּעַס is in a genitive relationship with אוֹיֵב (“[the] enemy”). The *origin* of the provocation is described by the noun אוֹיֵב. According to its context, the proud saying of the adversaries (“Our hand is triumphant, it was not YHWH who did all this.” Deut 32:27) is the source of YHWH’s provocation. The “enemy” and “the adversaries” are the nations who defeated the Israelites. In the end of the Song of Moses, YHWH will take vengeance

on His adversaries (Deut 32:43), but it is not said that this vengeance is related to the provocation. Therefore, there is no explicit punishment to the provocation of divine anger in this text.

(b) The verb כעס

The verb כעס, meaning “provoke to anger,”¹⁰¹ occurs six times in the book of Deuteronomy (Deut 4:25; 9:18; 31:29; 32:16, 21[2×]). Of which five are related to divine anger, that is, God is the direct object of the verb.¹⁰² The usage in Deuteronomy can be classified into two types.

In the first type, the verb כעס follows the verb קנא (“be jealous”). In each verse, the two verbs are in the same stem (Hiphil in Deut 32:16; Piel in Deut 32:21a), but there is no overall regular pattern. Both of them are in the Song of Moses (Deut 32).

Phrase with the verb כעס	Phrase with the verb קנא	Deut
בתועבת יכעיסהו (Hiphil)	יקנאהו בזרים (Hiphil)	32:16
כעסוני (Piel) בהבליהם	הם קנאוני בלא אל (Piel)	32:21a

According to the context of Deut 32:15-16, the subject of the verb יכעיסהו is ישראל.

¹⁰¹ HALOT 1:491. This verb is used frequently in Deuteronomy, the Deuteronomistic History and the book of Jeremiah. See Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 72; Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 155; Smith, *Deuteronomy*, 68; Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 208. One of the main themes of the Deuteronomistic History is that Israel sinned and provoked God to anger. The anger of YHWH put an end to the history of the Israelites. See Norbert Lohfink, “Der Zorn Gottes und das Exil: Beobachtungen am deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk,” 55. The verb is used in this key theme of the Deuteronomistic History. See Lohfink, “כעס,” *TDOT* 7:286-287. S. Joo’s study of the usage of the Hiphil of this verb כעס will be discussed in the next section.

¹⁰² In Deut 32:21, the verb כעס occurs two times. In the first one, YHWH is the object, while in the second YHWH is the subject. He provokes the Israelites to anger as a retribution for they have provoked Him to anger.

(“Jeshurun”), a term for the Israelites. The Hiphil of כעס is used with the third person masculine singular pronominal suffix. The antecedent to the pronominal suffix is אלוה (“God”) in Deut 32:15. Therefore, the object of כעס is the God who created the Israelites. In Deut 32:21 the construction is: כעסוני בהבליהם. The subject of the verb כעסוני (Piel) is בניו ובנותיו (“His sons and His daughters”) in Deut 32:19, that is, the Israelites. The object of the verb, the first person singular pronominal suffix, is YHWH because Deut 32:21 is part of a saying of YHWH which begins in Deut 32:20. The prepositional phrase בהבליהם (“with their vanities/ idols”) is used to modify the verb כעס, it explains how the Israelites have provoked YHWH to anger.

In the second type, a regular pattern is detected. The Hiphil infinitive construct of כעס has a prefixed preposition ל, is used with the third person masculine singular pronominal suffix, and is associated with the phrase יהוה בעיני הרע + עשה (“do” + “what is evil in the eyes of YHWH”).

Hiphil infinitive construct of כעס	“do” + “what is evil in the eyes of YHWH”	Deut
להכעיסו	...ועשיתם הרע בעיני יהוה אלהיך	4:25
להכעיסו	...לעשות הרע בעיני יהוה	9:18
להכעיסו...	...תעשו את הרע בעיני יהוה	31:29

The “YHWH” in the phrase “what is evil in the eyes of YHWH” is the antecedent to the objective pronominal suffix in להכעיסו, so YHWH is the object of the verb כעס.

There are several usages of an infinitive construct with a prefixed preposition ל.

Lohfink believes that this syntax is at least *consecutive* in meaning, but he further

suggests that it is justified in asking whether it is not in fact meant to express *purpose*: “Israel deliberately provoked Yahweh to anger.”¹⁰³ The ground for Lohfink’s second suggestion is the passage in Deut 32. However, it has been pointed out that the usage of the verb כעס in the Song of Moses is very different from its other occurrences in Deuteronomy. The pattern observed in Deut 4:25; 9:18 and 31:29 cannot be found in Deut 32. So the text of the Song of Moses cannot provide an interpretative basis for the meaning of the infinitive construct of כעס with a prefixed preposition ל. Instead of expressing *purpose*, the construction can express *result*: “so provoking Him to anger.”¹⁰⁴ The sin of “making [עשה] of an idol” and the “doing [עשה] of what is evil in the eyes of YHWH” will provoke YHWH to anger. In Deut 4:25-26, the sin refers to the *future* sin of the people, the punishment is the utter destruction [שמד] of the people. While in Deut 9:18-19, the sin refers to the *past* sin in the golden calf incident, the punishment is also the destruction [שמד] of the people. The sin in Deut 31:29 again refers to the *future* sin, but punishment is the befalling of the disaster [רעה].

(4) The verb עבר

The verb עבר occurs once in Deuteronomy, in Hitpael stem with YHWH as subject. עבר denotes strong fury,¹⁰⁵ and the tone is stronger than אנף.¹⁰⁶ The verb

¹⁰³ Lohfink, “כעס,” 286-287.

¹⁰⁴ J. C. L. Gibson, *Davidson’s Introductory Hebrew Grammar: Syntax* (4th ed.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 131; *IBHS*, 607.

¹⁰⁵ Cairns, *Deuteronomy*, 50-51; Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 227; Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 147.

עבר, can mean “to be angry”¹⁰⁷ or “to be furious.”¹⁰⁸ The noun עברה occurs thirty-four times in the Hebrew Bible. The emergence and expression of YHWH’s עברה are always understood as YHWH’s reaction to “inappropriate human behavior.”¹⁰⁹

In Deut 3:26, the verb עבר is used with the preposition ב (“with”). According to the context of Deut 3:26, there are two reasons for divine anger: למענכם (“for your sake”), and the prayer of Moses. The consequence is that Moses is rejected by YHWH. YHWH did not listen to Moses’ prayer. The punishment was kept the same and Moses was not allowed to enter the Promised Land.

(5) The group קצף

(a) The verb קצף

The verb קצף, meaning “to be angry,”¹¹⁰ occurs five times in the book of Deuteronomy. These five occurrences may be grouped into two types of usage: (i) The verb in the Qal stem is used with a divine subject (Deut 1:34; 9:19); (ii) The verb in the Hiphil stem is used with a divine object and human subject, and can be translated as someone (eg. the people) “made YHWH angry” or “provoked YHWH in anger” (Deut 9:7, 8, 22). The usage of the verb קצף in Deuteronomy can be shown from the following table:

¹⁰⁶ Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 60; Smith, *Deuteronomy*, 55.

¹⁰⁷ HALOT 1:781.

¹⁰⁸ DCH 6:242.

¹⁰⁹ Schunck, “עברה,” TDOT 10:429.

¹¹⁰ HALOT 2:1124.

Deut	Stem of קנף	Preposition	Object of the verb	Reason for divine anger	Consequence of divine anger
1:34	Qal	---	--- (the Israelites)	YHWH heard the words of the Israelites (Deut 1:27-28, 34)	YHWH swore that the first exodus generation could not see the land
9:19	Qal	על ("with")	"you" = the Israelites	the Israelites had made an image of calf (Deut 9:12, 16)	YHWH will destroy the Israelites
9:7	Hiphil	---	YHWH	the rebellion of the Israelites is against YHWH	No mention
9:8	Hiphil	---	YHWH	the Israelites had made an image of calf (Deut 9:12, 16)	YHWH will destroy the Israelites
9:22	Hiphil	---	YHWH	(Implicit)	No mention

The verb קנף in Deut 1:34 is not associated with a preposition and a human object, but the implied object of divine anger is very clear, it is "the Israelites." The reason for divine anger is the murmuring of the Israelites. They said that YHWH hated them and brought them out of Egypt to destroy them by the Amorites (Deut 1:27). And they quoted the words of the spies that the people were greater and taller than them; the cities were great and fortified up to heaven; the spies had seen the sons of the Anakim (Deut 1:28). YHWH heard these words and was angered (Deut 1:34). The punishment is that the first generation who left Egypt shall not see the Promised Land.

In Deut 9:18-19, divine anger is triggered by כל חטאתכם אשר חטאתם ("all the sin that you [the Israelites] had committed") and לעשות הרע בעיני יהוה (in doing what was evil in the eyes of YHWH). The punishment is that YHWH was ready to destroy (שמד) the Israelites.

In Deut 9:7, 8, 22, the verb קצף is used with human subject and divine object. In Deut 9:7 it is the reoccurring of the rebellion against YHWH that provoked Him to anger. There is no explicit mention of punishment towards their rebellion. In Deut 9:8 divine anger is set off by the action of the Israelites at Horeb. According to the context, the action is the making of the calf image (Deut 9:12, 16). The punishment is that YHWH was ready to destroy (שמר) the Israelites. In Deut 9:22 מקצפים (the Hiphil participle of the verb קצף) is used as an adjective with the main verb היה (“to be”). So, יהוה את ייתם מקצפים can be translated as “You are provocative against YHWH.” The reason for divine anger is not explicit, it just told the places at which they provoked YHWH to anger. The punishment is not mentioned. The reasons for divine anger in the texts in the above table are different. Nearly all the consequences of divine anger in these texts are very serious. The threat of destruction is inherent in this verb.¹¹¹

(b) The noun קצף

The noun קצף occurs once in Deuteronomy. In Deut 29:27 (28 ET) קצף with the preposition ב is one of the three prepositional phrases ובקצף ובחמה ובאף (“in anger, in rage, and in wrath”). The noun קצף is modified by the adjective גדול (“great”) which follows it. The reason for divine anger is that the Israelites abandoned the covenant which YHWH made with them. They turned, served and

¹¹¹ Reiterer, “קצף,” *TDOT* 13:92.

worshipped other gods (Deut 29:24-25[25-26 ET]). The punishment is the pulling out of the people and the throwing of them into another land by YHWH. The three adverbial prepositional phrases are used to describe the pulling out and throwing actions.

After the above discussion, we will pay attention to the punishments triggered by divine anger in Deuteronomy. The following table shows the object, the sin and the punishment from God.¹¹²

¹¹² Deut 13:18 is not shown in the table because it tells a promise of turning from divine anger rather than an occurrence of divine wrath.

The object of divine anger, the sin and the punishment in Deuteronomy

	Object of divine anger		Sin			Punishment			
	Israel	Others	Idolatry	Doing evil	Others	Destruction	Measure for measure	Removal of Gift	Others
1:34	✓				Rebelling against the command of YHWH (1:26) Not believing in Him (1:32)			✓ Exclusion	
1:37		Moses			No mention				Exclusion
3:26		Moses			No mention				No mention
4:21		Moses			No mention				Exclusion
4:25-26	✓		✓	✓		✓ (שמר) and אבר	✓		
6:15	✓		✓			✓ (שמר)			
7:4	✓		✓			✓ (שמר)			
9:7	✓				Rebelling against YHWH				No mention
9:8	✓		✓			✓ (שמר)			
9:18	✓			✓					No mention
9:19	✓		✓			✓ (שמר)			
9:20		Aaron	✓			✓ (שמר)			
9:22	✓				No mention				No mention
11:17	✓		✓			✓ (אבר)		✓	
29:19		A man			Hearing words of curse and walking in his stubbornness		✓		
29:22		Sodom etc...			No mention				Overthrow
29:23		The land	✓		The Israelites' abandonment of the covenant of YHWH				Calamities
29:26		The land	✓						Bringing curses on the land
29:27	✓		✓						Exile
31:17	✓		✓		Forsaking God		✓		Forsaking the Israelites
31:29	✓			✓			✓		Evil/ disaster
32:16	✓		✓	✓					No mention
32:19	✓		✓						Rejection of the Israelites
32:21	✓		✓		Making YHWH jealous		✓		Making the Israelites jealous
32:22	✓		✓						Burning of the fire of God's anger
32:27		The enemy			Misunderstanding				No mention

From the above table, in Deuteronomy, the objects of divine anger are the Israelites and individuals (Moses, Aaron, Someone, the city Sodom, the land, and the enemy). Most of the mentions of divine anger are caused by clear mentions of sins. The sin of idolatry occurs fifteen out of twenty-six times. It is the sin with frequent occurrence.

Three general ways which God will punish the Israelites when He is angry can be derived. These three ways show that God will punish his people in a *reasonable* way even in His anger. In the first place, it is the way of “destruction.” In most of the cases of the sin of idolatry, God will destroy the Israelites. For instance, in Deut 6:14-15, Moses warns that the Israelites should not follow other gods, otherwise they will be destroyed. In the incident of the golden calf, the Israelites had made YHWH very angry, and He wanted to destroy them (Deut 9:8, 19). Two verbs are used in these destructions: **שָׁמַד** and **אָבַד**.

The verb **שָׁמַד** meaning “to destroy” occurs seven times in Deuteronomy. Norbert Lohfink points out that the verb **שָׁמַד** is used in three most important contexts of Deuteronomy: curse texts, the incident of Israel’s sin at Horeb, and the destruction of indigenous nations during the occupation.¹¹³ In the incident of Israel’s sin at Horeb (Deut 9), there are three occurrences of the destruction. The parallel account in Exodus does not use the verb **שָׁמַד**.¹¹⁴ In Deut 9 the consequence of YHWH’s anger is **שָׁמַד**, while in Exod 32:10 it is **אָכַל**.¹¹⁵ The root **שָׁמַד** is thus

¹¹³ Lohfink, “שָׁמַד,” *TDOT* 15:188-189.

¹¹⁴ Lohfink, *TDOT* 15:192.

¹¹⁵ Lohfink, *TDOT* 15:192.

specific to the book of Deuteronomy as a means of interpreting the tradition of Israel's sin at Horeb.¹¹⁶ Since the verb שָׁמַר has been used seven times in Deut 28, Lohfink suggests that the שָׁמַר terminology in Deut 9 is borrowed from the curse texts of Deut 28 in order to establish a theological context.¹¹⁷

The verb אָבַד meaning “to destroy” occurs three times with divine anger in Deuteronomy. For the usage of אָבַד, Otzen states that the destructions will come under divine judgment and perish. The divine judgment and perishing will happen to Israel because of her disobedience to the law and her idolatry. In most of the related passages in the Hebrew Bible, there recurs the typical expression, “and you shall perish from the land....” Thus, in these texts, the divine punishment consists in God's driving his people out of the land.¹¹⁸

The second way is “measure for measure.” The punishment is measured according to the sin of the Israelites. In Deut 29:18-19 (19-20 ET), when someone hears the words of curses (אֱלֹהִים), and he thinks that he will be safe even if he walks in the stubbornness of his heart, then all the curses (אֱלֹהִים) will be upon him. In Deut 31:16-17, when the Israelites forsake (עֲזַב) YHWH, then YHWH will forsake (עֲזַב) them. In Deut 32:21, when the Israelites made YHWH jealous (קִנָּא) with what is “not god,” and provoked (כַּעַס) YHWH with their idols, YHWH will make them jealous (קִנָּא) with who is “not people,” and provoke (כַּעַס) them with a foolish

¹¹⁶ Lohfink, *TDOT* 15: 192.

¹¹⁷ Lohfink, *TDOT* 15: 192.

¹¹⁸ Otzen, “אָבַד,” *TDOT* 1:22.

nation.

The third way is “removal of gift.” YHWH intends to give His gifts to the Israelites. If they sin, YHWH will take away the gift. In Deut 11: 13-17, God will give rain (מטר) to the land of the Israelites, and the people can gather in their grain. But if they serve and worship other gods, God will shut the heavens and there will be no rain (מטר) and the land will yield no fruit. The gift of rain and grain to the land will be removed.

To summarise, a word study on different expression of divine anger in Deuteronomy has been carried out, and the uniqueness of the words of anger has been pointed out. In addition, the punishments triggered by divine anger are classified into three main principles: destruction, measure for measure, and removal of gift. These results highlight the peculiarities of the exclusion of Moses with whom God was angry with not because of his sin. In addition, the punishment on Moses was measured according to the sin of the Israelites, not Moses himself.

4. Conclusion

This chapter has interpreted Deut 1:37; 3:26-27 in their own context. In regard to Deut 1:37-38, we first argue that they are original, and not secondary additions. Then we examine the spy narrative in Deut 1:19-46, which is the context of Deut 1:37. Since Num 13-14 also give us another version of the spy story, we carry out a comparison of these two versions. The result shows that the relationship between

Num 13-14 and Deut 1:19-46 is very complicated. There is two-way inter-dependence between the Numeri version and the Deuteronomic version. Num 13-14 is formed by integration of Deut 1:19-46 and an older tradition which may also have been used by Deut 1. Certain parts were further redacted by later redactors.

In the context of Deut 1:19-46, Moses was not sinful. It is not necessary to deduce that Moses alluded to the incident of the waters of Meribah when he said that YHWH was angry with him because of the people. Moses was innocent, and he does not suffer vicariously. As a leader, he suffered with the people. But it is not accurate to say that the announcement of punishment and reward in Deut 1:35-39 is controlled by the principle of “corporate responsibility.” In that passage, we can see *both* the concepts of “individual responsibility” and “corporate responsibility.” This coexistence of “individual responsibility” and “corporate responsibility” suggests that it is difficult to apply only one principle to the reality.

In Deut 3:23-28, YHWH was angry with Moses because Moses irritated YHWH with his prayer, and also because of the Israelites. Moses felt the anger of YHWH because he heard that God told him not to ask for entering the land again. However Moses was not punished after this divine anger. He was not permitted to pray that request again. The exclusion of Moses is not directly related to divine anger in Deut 3:26. The term “for your sake” is used to clarify that Moses did not sin, and to illustrate that the sin of the first exodus generation was very great.

A word study on different expression of divine anger in Deuteronomy has been carried out, and the uniqueness of the words of anger has been pointed out.

Twenty-one out of the twenty-seven occurrences of the wrath of God in Deuteronomy are due to human sin. In addition, the punishments triggered by divine anger are classified into three main principles: destruction, measure for measure, and removal of gift. These results highlight the peculiarities of the exclusion of Moses with whom God was angry with not because of his sin. In addition, the punishment which Moses received was measured according to the sin of the Israelites, not Moses himself. In the next chapter, an interpretation of Deut 4 and the theme of divine anger in the framework of the Deuteronomistic History will be carried out.

Chapter Five: The “Anger-Punishment Pattern” in Deut 4

In this present chapter, the exclusion of Moses will be studied in the context of Deut 4, then we will use the “lens” of the theme of the anger of God in the Deuteronomistic History to interpret divine anger on Moses.

1. Reason for divine anger on Moses in Deut 4

Our third passage which depicts divine anger on Moses is in Deut 4:21-28. In Deut 4 Moses highlights that the importance of keeping the statutes and rules is that the Israelites may live in the Promised Land (Deut 4:1-2). After telling the theme of a contrast between destroying and living (Deut 4:3-4), Moses explains the origin of the ten words of YHWH which was commanded at Horeb (Deut 4:9-14). When YHWH spoke to the people at Horeb, He did not appear in any form in order to forbid the people from making a carved image (Deut 4:15-20). In Deut 4:21-28 Moses retells that he was not allowed to enter the good land that the people would enter. However, Moses also foretells that the people would be destroyed in the land because they would make a carved image in the future. YHWH would scatter them among the peoples, and the Israelites would serve the idols there.

In our present study, Deut 4:21-28 is treated as a unit. There is a suggestion that this unit was composed by different hands because Deut 4:21-22 was used to provide

a transition from historical narrative to law, and Deut 4:23-28 was a later addition on the subject of image worship.¹ But such a suggestion overlooks the clear links between verses 21-22 and verses 23-28. In the first place, the expression “crossing the Jordan,” which can be found in Deut 4:21-22 and 26, well connects 4:21-22 and 23-28. The function of Deut 4:21-22 is to highlight the gift which the Israelites would receive from God. They could live on the land that they were crossing the Jordan to occupy, while Moses could not cross the Jordan. In addition, YHWH is depicted as the active agent who did not allow Moses to enter the land, and would destroy and scatter the Israelites. In both 4:21-22 and 4:23-28 YHWH alone can decide who can live in the land.

It should be noticed that in Deut 4:21-22 Moses has mentioned his death which is not mentioned in Deut 1:37 and 3:26-27. His death and his exclusion from the land can be paralleled with the destruction and the scattering of the future generations of the Israelites. In fact, the whole passage of Deut 4:21-22 can be compared to the destiny of the future generations as the following table shows.

	Moses (Deut 4:21-22)	The future generations (Deut 4:23-28)
Divine anger	“YHWH was angry with me...” (v. 21)	“... to provoke Him to anger.” (v. 25)
Cause of divine anger	“... because of your words” (v. 21)	“... act corruptly, make an idol in the form of anything, do the evil in the eyes of YHWH...” (v. 25)
Death as a punishment	“I will die in this land...” (v. 22)	“... you shall be utterly destroyed.” (v. 26)
Not allowing living in the land as a	“I would not cross the Jordan...” (vv. 21-22) “...I would not enter the	“YHWH will scatter you among the peoples...” (v.27)

¹ Nelson, *Double Redaction*, 94.

punishment	good land...” (v. 21)	
------------	-----------------------	--

Although Moses repeated twice that he would not cross over the Jordan (Deut 4:21, 22), this is not his main focus. His main point is to contrast the Israelites who would cross over and take possession of the land (Deut 4:22, 26). We find that YHWH was angry with Moses (Deut 4:21), and the Israelites would provoke YHWH to anger (Deut 4:25) as well. Besides, Moses would die beyond the Jordan (Deut 4:22), the future generations of the Israelites would be destroyed after crossing the Jordan (Deut 4:26). The extinction of the *future* generations is interpreted as a consequence of provoking YHWH to anger just as the death of Moses is interpreted as the consequence of divine anger. The “scattering” (פִּזְיוֹ [Hiphil]) is another consequence of divine anger, it is parallel to the exclusion of Moses. The common point between the “scattering” and the exclusion is that the Israelites could not live in the Promised Land.

In Deut 4:21 the verb אָנַף (“to be angry”) is used. This is the same verb used in Deut 1:37. Its usage is discussed in the previous chapter. In Deut 4:25 the verb for divine anger is כִּעַס, with the meaning “to provoke ... to anger,”² it occurs six times in the Pentateuch (only in the book of Deuteronomy)³ and fifty-four times in the Hebrew Bible. This verb is used frequently in Deuteronomy, the Deuteronomistic History and the book of Jeremiah.⁴ One of the main themes of the Deuteronomistic work is that the Israelites sinned, and they provoked God to anger. The verb is used

² HALOT 1:491.

³ Deut 4:25; 9:18; 31:29; 32:16, 21(2×).

⁴ Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 72; Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 155; Smith, *Deuteronomy*, 68; Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 208.

in this key theme.⁵ The preposition ל is used with the infinitive construct, forming להכעיסו, to express consequence or result.⁶ This infinitival construction can hardly be purposive, nor is it complementary.⁷ Thus, the result of doing evil in the eyes of YHWH was that it provoked Him to anger. Finally, the anger of YHWH could put an end to the kingdoms of the Israelites.

Samantha Joo's study of the usage of the Hiphil of the verb כעס has been introduced in Chapter Two. Deut 4:25-27 is assigned as a unit in Joo's second redaction level of the Deuteronomistic History. She claims that from the time of Moses, the people had been warned about the consequences of their provocation of God.⁸ In these descriptions, God is usually portrayed as the primary agent of destruction.⁹ God is depicted as acting alone, he punishes the Israelites and delivers them into the hands of the enemy.¹⁰ Since the people forgot the covenant of YHWH and made an idol image, they should bear the responsibility for the destruction and the "scattering." If Joo's thesis is right, then the contrast between divine anger on Moses in Deut 4:21 and divine anger on the people in Deut 4:25 is great. Moses was innocent, but the people had the punishment that they deserved.

The innocence of Moses is highlighted by using the expression על דבריכם. This expression occurs only once in the Hebrew Bible. It hardly means "for your

⁵ Lohfink, "כעס," *TDOT* 7:286-287.

⁶ Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 60.

⁷ Wevers, *Greek text of Deuteronomy*, 80-81.

⁸ Joo, *Provocation*, 226.

⁹ Joo, *Provocation*, 71.

¹⁰ Joo, *Provocation*, 226.

sake” as Bertholet maintains¹¹ because the assumption that this term is the same as **בגללכם** (Deut 1:37) and **למענכם** (Deut 3:26) does not have a solid ground. Rather, **על דבריכם** can be translated as “because of your words” in which the “words” refer to the “murmurings” of the people in the spy story.¹² The Israelites were afraid and gave murmurings when they received the report of the spies.¹³ In Deut 1:34 YHWH heard the voice of the Israelites’ words, and He proclaimed the judgment on the people and Moses. Thus, **על דבריכם** is an explanatory interpretation of **בגללכם** in Deut 1:37.¹⁴ Therefore, the function of “because of your words” is clarifying that Moses was punished because of the murmurings of the people in the spy story. This is also the understanding of the LXX translator who translates **על דבריכם** as *περὶ τῶν λεγομένων ὑφ’ ὑμῶν* (“because of the words being said by you”).

The extinction of the future generations of the Israelites in Deut 4:25-28 can be interpreted by the three punishment principles which we have discussed in the previous chapter. Firstly, “destruction,” the Israelites will make an idol **כעס** (“to provoke”) YHWH, and they will be **שמד** (“destroyed”) (Deut 4:26). The key word **שמד** is used just as it is used in Deut 6-9. Secondly, “measure for measure,” the future Israelites will *make* an idol, then they will worship the gods *made* by the hands of man (Deut 4:27). Thirdly, “removal of gift,” the Israelites will do evil in the *land*, then they have to leave the *land* because YHWH will scatter them and drive them to

¹¹ Bertholet, *Deuteronomium*, 17.

¹² Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 244; Perlitt, *Deuteronomium*, 336-337.

¹³ Veijola, *Deuteronomium*, 114.

¹⁴ Perlitt, *Deuteronomium*, 336-337.

the nations (Deut 4:27).

To summarise, in Deut 4 Moses's exclusion is used to compare to the destruction and "scattering" of the future generations who could live in the land. Moses was excluded because of divine anger and the sin of the first generation. The future generations were destroyed and scattered because of their own sin which provoked YHWH to anger.

2. The theme of divine anger in the Deuteronomistic History

We have discussed the exclusion of Moses in the context of Deut 4:21-28. If Deut 4 is one of the layers of the Deuteronomistic History, how can the exclusion of Moses be understood in the framework of the Deuteronomistic History? In this section we will propose the scheme of "anger-punishment pattern" in the Deuteronomistic History to interpret the exclusion of Moses. This "anger-punishment pattern" is built on the "wrath formulae" of Dennis McCarthy and Norbert Lohfink.

McCarthy notices that there are two basic phrases to speak of divine wrath in the Deuteronomistic History: one is "the anger of YHWH blazes" or "YHWH is angry" (McCarthy names this as the "anger formula"); the other is "one provokes YHWH to rage" (it is named as the "provocation formula").¹⁵ Each formula has its

¹⁵ Dennis J. McCarthy, "The Wrath of Yahweh and the Structural Unity of the Deuteronomistic History," in *Essays in Old Testament* (ed. James L. Crenshaw et al.; New York: KTAV Publ. House, 1974), 100.

own immediate associations. The “anger formula” is typically the climax of a stylized description of Israel’s desertion of YHWH. This is an assertion that the covenant is broken when the Israelites broke the relation with YHWH and formed a covenant with another god.¹⁶ A divine judgment announcing a penalty always ties to this “anger formula.” On the contrary, the “provocation formula” is not closely tied to the announcement of a penalty and the stylized description of infidelity involving the whole nation.¹⁷ Hence, McCarthy observes that the announcement of a penalty is another factor to distinguish these two formulae.¹⁸

Lohfink disagrees with the point of McCarthy that the “provocation formula” does not link to penalty on the ground that there are penalties following the “provocation formula” in the three dynasties of the Northern Kingdom.¹⁹ The word *שָׁמַד* (“to destroy”) does follow the “provocation formula.” Thus Lohfink claims that both the “anger formula” and the “provocation formula” are parallel, and are based

¹⁶ McCarthy, “Wrath,” 100.

¹⁷ McCarthy, “Wrath,” 100.

¹⁸ McCarthy’s contribution is great for he is the first who distinguishes the two wrath formulae and discusses them in relation to the structure of the Deuteronomistic History. However, his study of divine anger in the book of Deuteronomy is highly selective. With regard to the “anger formula” in Deuteronomy, it can be found in Deut 1:34, 37; 4:21; 6:15; 9:7-8, 19-20; 11:17; 29:19, 26, 27; 31:17; while the “provocation formula” is in Deut 4:25; 9:18; 31:29; 32:16, 19, 21. Nevertheless, McCarthy only selects Deut 31:16-19 and then talks about the intention of linking the anger with the passing of a leader which marks the transition to the conquest era. His conclusion only fits the particular passage in Deut 31 and not all the texts with divine anger in the book of Deuteronomy. Furthermore, the connection of divine anger with transition of leadership does not appear in most of the above occurrences in Deuteronomy. Therefore, McCarthy has not identified the uniqueness of the usage of divine anger in Deuteronomy. His interpretation cannot reflect the whole picture of Deuteronomy or the three occurrences of divine anger on Moses.

¹⁹ Norbert Lohfink, “Der Zorn Gottes und das Exil. Beobachtungen am deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk,” in *Liebe und Gebot: FS L. Perlitt* (ed. R. G. Kratz et al.; FRLANT 190; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 137-155; repr. , N. Lohfink, *Studien zum Deuteronomium und zur deuteronomistischen Literatur V* (SBAB 38; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2005), 37-55.

on a single basic scheme.²⁰ Both the formulae will result in destruction.²¹ Lohfink himself suggests an “exile formula” which does not end in destruction.

The studies of McCarthy and Lohfink bring out the important role of the “wrath formulae” in the Deuteronomistic History. The naming of the formulae by them shows their different emphasis on the character of the formulae. McCarthy calls them the “anger formula” and the “provocation formula.” The names indicate their connections to divine anger. Regarding Lohfink’s “exile formula,” it omits the anger of God, but focuses more on the punishment, the exile. There should be a more systematic naming scheme for these “formulae.” To integrate the different names, I propose the scheme of the “anger-punishment pattern,” of which both the “anger-destruction pattern”²² and the “anger-exile pattern”²³ belong as sub-groups. In addition, for our present study, I also propose an “anger-exclusion pattern” which includes the exclusion of Moses. We use the word “pattern” instead of “formula” because, as we shall see, different verbs or nouns for divine anger and punishments are used, and the variations among the passages are so great that they cannot be said to be “formulae.”

(1) The “anger-destruction pattern”

²⁰ Lohfink, “Zorn Gottes,” 145.

²¹ Lohfink, “Zorn Gottes,” 146.

²² It is equal to McCarthy’s two “wrath formulae.”

²³ It is equal to Lohfink’s “exile formula.”

We will first deal with the “anger-destruction pattern.” There are eight texts which connect “divine anger” with “destruction” in Deuteronomy, and four in the Former Prophets.

The “anger-destruction pattern” in the Deuteronomistic History

	Cause of Divine Anger	Word for Divine Anger	Word for Destruction
1 Deut 4:25-26	Making an idol and doing what is evil in the sight of YHWH. (4:25)	כעס (Hiph, infc)	אבד (Qal, infa & Qal) שמד (Niph, infa & Niph)
2 Deut 6:15	Following other gods. (6:14)	אף (n)	שמד (Hiph)
3 Deut 7:4	Serving other gods. (7:4)	אף (n)	שמד (Hiph)
4 Deut 9:8	Making an idol, the calf (9:12), and doing what is evil in the sight of YHWH. (9:18)	קצף (Hiph) אנף (Hith)	שמד (Hiph, infc)
5 Deut 9:19		אף (n) חמה (n) קצף (Qal)	שמד (Hiph, infc)
6 Deut 9:20		אנף (Hith)	שמד (Hiph, infc)
7 Deut 11:17	Serving and worshiping other gods. (11:16)	אף (n)	אבד (Qal)
8 Deut 31:17	Prostituting themselves after foreign gods, forsaking YHWH, and breaking the covenant of YHWH. (31:16)	חרה (Qal) אף (n)	אכל (Qal, infc)
9 Josh 22:20	Sin of Achan (Unfaithful action)	קצף (n)	גוע (Qal)
10 Josh 23:16	Transgression of the covenant and serving other gods	חרה (Qal) אף (n)	אבד (Qal)
11 1Kgs 16:12-13	Idols worshiping	כעס (Hiph, infc)	שמד (Hiph)
12 2Kgs 22:17	Forsaking YHWH and worshiping other gods	כעס (Hiph, infc) חמה (n)	יצת (Niph)

(n = noun; Qal = Qal; Hiph = Hiphil; Niph = Niphal; Hith = Hithpael; infa =

infinitive absolute; infc = infinitive construct)

In spite of different expressions of divine anger²⁴ and different verbs of destruction²⁵ are used, the pattern occurs similarly, and the concept is the same: the destruction is a result of divine anger. Although we have listed out all the occurrences of these patterns before making a comparison, a detailed study of the usage of different words will not be done here, for the present purpose is just to show the general pattern of the theme of divine anger.

The “anger-destruction pattern” carries out several functions. First, the divine anger pattern serves to reinforce some of the key speeches and essays in their function of structuring the narrative.²⁶ The distribution of the “anger-destruction pattern” is similar to that of McCarthy’s “anger formula,” which can be found in the framework of Deuteronomy, at the end of the Book of Joshua, and at the end of the story of the kingdoms.²⁷ Thus, the references to divine anger are concentrated at certain key points, among them the major transitions from one to another of the eras which characterize the Deuteronomistic narrative.²⁸ An inter-relationship between the anger of YHWH and the destruction of the people is highlighted.

Second, the “anger-destruction pattern” marks out the responsibility of the people. Ten out of the twelve occurrences of the pattern are related to the sin of the

²⁴ קצף, כעס, חרה, חמה, אף, אנה.

²⁵ שמד, יצת, גוע, אכל, אבד.

²⁶ However, the “anger-destruction pattern” does not serve to say that all transitions are dangerous. This is different from McCarthy’s “anger formula.” See McCarthy, “Wrath,” 102-3.

²⁷ McCarthy, “Wrath,” 101.

²⁸ McCarthy, “Wrath,” 101.

people, exceptions are Josh 22:20 and 1 Kgs 16:12-13. In the former, the cause of divine wrath is the unfaithful action of Achan, while in the latter the sin of king Baasha and his son Elah is the problem. From the above table, the cause of divine anger is usually related to the apostasy of the Israelites. In the eight occurrences of the “anger-destruction pattern” of Deuteronomy, three of them (Deut 9:8, 19, 20) are used in the incident of Israel’s sin at Horeb. It is about the idols which the *first generation* of the Israelites made. The other five occurrences point to the apostasy of the *future generations* of the Israelites. It shows that the “anger-destruction pattern” is applied to both the *future* generations and the *first* generation of the people who left Egypt. In the Former Prophets, three of the four causes of divine anger are idolatry of the Israelites.

Third, the pattern works in the formation of a “well-knit structure” in the Deuteronomistic History, tying beginning (Deuteronomy) to end (Book of Kings).²⁹ It should be noticed that there are close links between the first “anger-destruction pattern” (Deut 4:25-26) and the last (2 Kgs 22:17). Both of them use the verb כעס for divine anger. In Deut 4:25-26 Moses, the first prophet in Deuteronomy, foretold that the future generations of the Israelites כעס (“would provoke”) YHWH to anger by עשה (“doing”) what was evil in the eyes of YHWH. In 2 Kgs 22:17 Huldah, the last prophetess in the Deuteronomistic work, proclaimed the message of YHWH that the people כעס (“had provoked”) YHWH to anger with all their מעשה (“deeds”).

²⁹ McCarthy, “Wrath,” 106.

These two “anger-destruction patterns” connect Deut 4 with 2 Kgs 22, where probably the original form of Deuteronomy was found before the reforms of king Josiah (2 Kgs 23).

The “anger-destruction pattern” can be found in important transition stages of the Deuteronomistic History and suggests that the interpretation of the punishment as divine anger is well accepted by the Deuteronomists’ traditions. The editors agree with the idea that the history of a nation would be affected and altered by divine anger. When the people of Israel rebelled against YHWH or committed evil deeds, it would make YHWH angry. The prophets have warned the people that these sins would provoke YHWH’s anger. The divine anger will initiate the means of punishment, and then destruction would occur. This interpretation has become a *pattern* with fixed logic but various terms have been used to describe divine anger or the destruction. This idea was common in the ancient Near Eastern texts, the nations around Israel also believed that gods would be angry with his people.³⁰

³⁰ Betril Albrektson, *History and Gods* (Lund: Gleerup, 1967), 31, 32, 100, 114; John C. Gibson, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions Vol. 1: Hebrew and Moabite inscriptions* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1971), 74-76; James A. Montgomery, *The Books of Kings* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1951), 235-236; For recent studies, see Ed. R. G. Kratz and H. Spieckermann, *Divine Wrath and Divine Mercy in the World of Antiquity* (FAT 2/33; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008).

(2) The “anger-exile pattern”

The “anger-exile pattern” in the Deuteronomistic History

Text	Cause of Divine Anger	Word for Divine Anger	Word for Exile
1 Deut 4:25-27	Making an idol and doing what is evil in the eyes of YHWH (4:25)	כעס (Hiph, infc)	פוץ (Hiph)
2 Deut 29:27 (28 ET)	Forsaking the covenant of YHWH (Deut 29:24) and serving other gods (Deut 29:25)	אף (n) חמה (n) קצף (n)	נתש (Qal) שלך (Hiph)
3 1 Kgs 8:46	Israelites' sin against YHWH	אנף (Qal)	שבה (Qal)
4 1 Kgs 14:15	Making of Asherim (idolatry)	כעס (Hiph, ptp)	נתש (Qal) זרה (Piel)
5 2 Kgs 17:17-20	Abandonment of all the commandments of YHWH and idolatry	כעס (Hiph, infc) אנף (Hith)	סור (Hiph) שלך (Hiph)
6 2 Kgs 23:26-27	The sin of Manasseh (Different types of idolatry, cf. 2 Kgs 21:1-9)	חרון (n) אף (n, 2×) חרה (Qal) כעס (n) כעס (Hiph)	סור (Hiph, 2×)
7 2 Kgs 24:20	(The evil action of Zedekiah)	אף (n)	שלך (Hiph, infc)

(n= noun; Qal = Qal; Piel = Piel; Hiph = Hiphil; Niph = Niphal; infc = infinitive

construct; ptp= participle)

Here we have a cluster of seven “anger-exile patterns” in which different words for

divine anger³¹ and different verbs for the exile³² are used. Nevertheless, the

“anger-exile pattern” is still very clear. This pattern is built on Lohfink’s “exile

formula,”³³ which is developed from McCarthy’s “anger formula” and “provocation

³¹ קצף, כעס, חרה, חרון, חמה, אף, אנף.

³² שלך, שבה, סור, נתש, זרה.

³³ Lohfink, “Zorn Gottes,” 137-155.

formula.” Lohfink observes that there is a variation in 2 Kgs 17. Both the formulae are found, but the word שָׂמַד (“to destroy”) is absent, moreover, the words סֹרַר (“to remove”) and שָׁלַךְ (“to cast/ throw”) are present.³⁴ The results of divine wrath are changed to the removing and throwing out of the Israelites, such punishment can be classified as “exile,” and so Lohfink calls this the “exile formula.”³⁵ The consequence of McCarthy’s two formulae is destruction, while that of Lohfink’s formula is exile.³⁶

How was the “exile formula” formed? Lohfink proposes that it came from the re-interpretation of the wrath of God by the Deuteronomists, who modified the “anger formula” and the “provocation formula” to the “exile formula.”³⁷ Lohfink has two grounds for his proposal. First, in Deut 28:63 the word שָׂמַד is re-interpreted. It is not a statement of a dark ending any more, but a heading for its following sentence.³⁸ Second, in Deut 29 the “exile formula” is introduced.³⁹ In Deut 29:21-27 (22-28 ET) the object of divine anger is the *land*, not the *people*.⁴⁰ The land was burnt and resulted in devastation. The Israelites would be thrown out into another land, but it is not said that they would be destroyed. Therefore, according to Lohfink, the “anger formula” is developed into the “exile formula” by omitting the

³⁴ Lohfink, “Zorn Gottes,” 150.

³⁵ Lohfink, “Zorn Gottes,” 150.

³⁶ Lohfink, “Zorn Gottes,” 151.

³⁷ Lohfink, “Zorn Gottes,” 151.

³⁸ Lohfink, “Zorn Gottes,” 153.

³⁹ Lohfink, “Zorn Gottes,” 154.

⁴⁰ Lohfink, “Zorn Gottes,” 154.

word שֹׁמֵד, and using the word שָׁלַךְ.⁴¹ Instead of destruction, there would be deportation of the people.⁴² Thus, Lohfink concludes that the Deuteronomists re-interpreted the “anger formula” because they knew and wrestled with the wrath of God.⁴³ They discovered that even if their God was still so severe, in the end He could not give up His love for Israel.⁴⁴

Lohfink’s suggestion of the “exile formula” as a re-interpretation of the Deuteronomists is persuasive. There is, however, one point deserving to be clarified. He claims that in Deut 28:63 the word שֹׁמֵד is re-interpreted from a dark ending to a new title,⁴⁵ but he does not explain how he can draw this claim in that essay. We can find his reasoning from another article of his, “שֹׁמֵד,” in volume 15 of *TDOT*. In that article he explains that Deut 28:63 does *not* end with an “infinitive construction” conveying the totality of the destruction.⁴⁶ Instead, the two verbs (שֹׁמֵד and אָבַד) appear in “finite” form as a kind of new title, in which the following verses of Deut 28:63 develop as they depict life in exile.⁴⁷ Thus, his key basis is the change of form of אָבַד and שֹׁמֵד from “infinitive” (in Deut 28:20, 24, 45, 48, 51, 61) to “finite” form (28:63). Against this we may argue that there is no change of “finite” form at all. According to the text of Deut 28:63, אָבַד appears as לֵהאבִיד, and שֹׁמֵד as וְלֵהשְׁמִיד. Both of them are infinitives, *not* finites. If there is no change of infinitive

⁴¹ Lohfink, “Zorn Gottes,” 155.

⁴² Lohfink, “Zorn Gottes,” 155.

⁴³ Lohfink, “Zorn Gottes,” 155.

⁴⁴ Lohfink, “Zorn Gottes,” 155.

⁴⁵ Lohfink, “Zorn Gottes,” 153.

⁴⁶ Lohfink, “שֹׁמֵד,” *TDOT* 15:190.

⁴⁷ Lohfink, *TDOT* 15:190.

construction, it is suspected that Deut 28:63 can still be read as a new title for the verses after it. Although the above claim of re-interpretation in Deut 28:63 is in doubt, most of Lohfink's other arguments are convincing. His observations on the absence of the verb שָׁמַר and the presence of the verb שָׁלַח in Deut 29 and 2 Kgs 17 are correct. Besides, his suggestions to this replacement of verbs are also highly possible.

Just like McCarthy's wrath "formulae" which serve to reinforce some of the key speeches and essays to structure the narrative,⁴⁸ the seven "anger-exile patterns" found in the curial parts of the Deuteronomistic work also have the same function. The first two of them can be found in the frame of Deuteronomy (Deut 4:25-27 and Deut 29:27); 1 Kgs 8:46 is in the prayer of Solomon; 1 Kgs 14:15 is in the speech of the prophet Ahijah; 2 Kgs 17:18 belongs to the Deuteronomists' explanation of the fall of Samaria and the Northern Kingdom; 2 Kgs 23:26-27 is the Deuteronomists' note of the coming of the doom even after the reform of King Josiah; 2 Kgs 24:20 is an explanation of the fall of Jerusalem. Idolatry and the evil actions of the kings are the main causes for divine wrath.

We will select four of them to illustrate the characteristics of the "anger-exile pattern." The first one can be found in Deut 4:27. In Chapter Three we have pointed out that the usage of the verb פָּוֶץ ("to scatter") in Deut 4:27 is different from the usual understanding of the exile. Usually, the verbs סָר ("to remove") or שָׁלַח ("to

⁴⁸ McCarthy, "Wrath," 103.

cast/ throw”) or גלה (“to take into exile”/ “to deport”) will be used for the carrying of the people into exile. In addition, the “peoples” and “nations” in Deut 4:27 are *plural* rather than *singular*. The scattering of the people into different nations matches the dispersion of the Jews throughout the nations, a phenomenon that has its first peak in the Hellenistic period, two or three centuries after the Babylonian exile.⁴⁹ Therefore, the “anger-exile pattern” in Deut 4:27 is a varied form.

The second “anger-exile pattern” in Deut 29 deserves a closer look. According to Lohfink, it was introduced by the Deuteronomists as an “exile formula” after a series of sentences of destruction in Deut 28. It seems that this does not belong to one of the early layers of the Deuteronomistic work because its comparison with Jer 21:5b and Ezek 19:12a will show that Deut 29:27 (28 ET) may be influenced by or share the tradition with the prophets.

	Jer 21:5b	Deut 29:27 (28 ET)	Ezek 19:12a
Deut parallels with Ezek, same verb נתש (“to uproot”)		ויתשם (Qal) יהוה	ותתש (Hophal)
		מעל אדמתם	
Deut parallel with Jer, same words for anger	ובאף	באף	
	ובחמה	ובחמה	בחמה
	ובקצף גדול	ובקצף גדול	
			לארץ
Deut parallels with Ezek, same verb שלך (“to cast”)		וישלכם (Hiphal)	השלכה (Hophal)
		אל ארץ	

⁴⁹ Lust, “Exile and Diaspora,” 99-122.

	Jer 21:5b	Deut 29:27 (28 ET)	Ezek 19:12a
Deut parallels with Ezek, same verb: “to uproot”		and YHWH uprooted them	But it was uprooted
		from their land	
Deut parallel with Jer, same words for anger	... and in anger,	in anger	
	in fury	and in fury	in fury;
	and in great wrath;	and in great wrath,	
			to the ground
Deut parallels with Ezek, same verb: “to cast”		and cast them	it was cast down.
		into another land,	

There are some similarities in the terms and pattern for divine anger in Deut 29:27 and Jer 21:5b. The three nouns for divine anger in Deut 29:27 and Jer 21:5b are the same, with the same preposition ב, and also in the same order. In the Hebrew Bible the juxtaposition of אַף, חמה and גְּדֹלָה קִצְף occurs only in Deut 29:27, Jer 21:5b and Jer 32:37. The expressions in Jer 32:37 are slightly different, they are “in My [=YHWH] anger, in My [=YHWH] fury and in great wrath.” Hence, it can be supposed that there is a parallel between Deut 29:27 and Jer 21:5b.

Regarding the verbs for exile, both Deut 29:27 and Ezek 19:12a use נָתַשׁ (“to uproot”) and שָׁלַךְ (“to cast/ throw”) in the same order. There are only three occurrences of the combination of נָתַשׁ and שָׁלַךְ in the Hebrew Bible: Deut 29:27; Ezek 19:12a and 2 Chr 7:20. In Deut 29:27 the direct object of נָתַשׁ and שָׁלַךְ is the Israelites. In Ezek 19:12a the vine, the mother of the princes of Israel (Ezek 19:1), is the one being uprooted and cast out. In 2 Chr 7:20 the object of נָתַשׁ is the Israelites, while that of שָׁלַךְ is “this house” where YHWH sanctified to His name, that is, the

temple. The affinity between Deut 29:27 and Ezek 19:12a is greater than that with 2 Chr 7:20 because the expression **וּבַחֶמֶה** (“and in fury”) can be found in Deut 29:27 and Ezek 19:12a, but it is absent in 2 Chr 7:20. The parallel between Deut 29:27, Jer 21:5b and Ezek 19:12a is too close to be accidental. It is possible that Deut 29:27 has merged the traditions of these two prophetic books.⁵⁰ If this is true, the “anger-exile pattern” in Deut 29:27 is inherited from the same traditions of Jer 21:5b (Jer 32:37) and Ezek 19:12a. Then, Deut 29:27 belongs to a late layer of the book of Deuteronomy.

The uniqueness of 1 Kgs 8:46 is that it is an exception on the subject of the verbs for exile. In all other six “anger-exile patterns” the subject of the verbs for exile is YHWH, while in this prayer of Solomon the expression **שְׂבִיָּהֶם** (“their captors”) is the subject of the verb **שָׁבַה** (“to carry”). When YHWH is the subject of the verbs for exile, the event of deportation is depicted as the work of God. He alone is the initiator of the exile. But, in fact, the exile in 1 Kgs 8:46 is not initiated by the captors. According to the context, it is YHWH who gives (**נָתַן**) the people to the enemy, so that the captors can carry the people to the land of the enemy. Therefore, in 1 Kgs 8:46 YHWH is the ultimate authority who let the people be carried into exile. When all the “anger-exile patterns” signify that YHWH is the active agent who initiates the exile, the lordship and sovereignty of YHWH on both the land and the Israelites is affirmed. YHWH alone can allow who can live in the land. It is also

⁵⁰ There is not sufficient evidence to draw this conclusion at this stage. The relationship is too complicated to be discussed here.

YHWH himself who can punish the Israelites according to His will.

Finally, we come to 2 Kgs 23:26-27. This “anger-exile pattern” occurs after a positive appraisal of king Josiah. The narrative of the reforms of Josiah (2 Kgs 23) is very interesting in that the reform movements⁵¹ are framed by two “anger-punishment patterns.” The first of them is an “anger-destruction pattern” which can be found before the making of the covenant with the people in the message of Huldah the prophetess (2 Kgs 22:17). This is the last occurrence of the “anger-destruction pattern.” After the reforms of Josiah we can only find the “anger-exile pattern,” but not the “anger-destruction pattern.” The other “anger-punishment pattern” which frames the reforms of Josiah, is in 2 Kgs 23:26-27. This framework of the reforms of Josiah tells us that king Josiah first heard a message with the “anger-destruction pattern” from Huldah the prophetess. But he was not discouraged by the message of destruction, rather, he was determined to repent with the people. After his three main reform movements, we do not find the message of destruction anymore. The “anger-destruction pattern” is replaced by the “anger-exile pattern;” and the latter is not as severe as the former. This replacement suggests that the reforms of Josiah could bring a certain degree of *hope* to the people. The readers of 2 Kgs 22-23 should grasp the chance to repent and obey God, just as king Josiah had done.

⁵¹ The three reform actions are: the making of the covenant with the people (2 Kgs 23:1-3), the reform of the cult (2 Kgs 23:4-20), and the restoration of the Passover (2 Kgs 23:21-23).

(3) The “anger-exclusion pattern” of Moses

The “anger-exclusion pattern” in Deut 4:21

	Cause of Divine Anger	Word for Divine Anger	Word for Exclusion
Deut 4:21	על דבריכם “because of your words”	אנה (Hiph)	לבלתי (Qal, infc) with עבר לבלתי (Qal, infc) with בוא

(Qal = Qal; Hiph = Hiphil; infc = infinitive construct)

Here, we come to the “anger-exclusion pattern” of Moses in Deut 4:21. The pattern of the “anger-exclusion pattern” is also very clear. Comparing with the previous tables of the “anger-destruction pattern” and “anger-exile pattern,” it can be noted that “the sin of Moses” is absent, while we can find the expression “because of your words.” Thus it seems that there is a replacement of the cause of divine anger in the “anger-punishment pattern” of Moses.

The Three Patterns

Patterns	Cause of Divine Anger
Anger-destruction pattern	The sin of the Israelites (the future generations)
Anger-exile pattern	The sin of the Israelites (the future generations)
Anger-exclusion pattern of Moses	The sin of the Israelites (the first generation)

From our observation on the “anger-exclusion pattern,” we propose that the replacement of the cause of divine anger may indicate a clarification of the innocence of Moses, and an emphasis on the sin of the Israelites. The Deuteronomists confessed the sin of the Israelites by using the “anger-destruction pattern” and the “anger-exile pattern” which explain that the sins of the kings and the people provoked YHWH to anger, which caused the fall of Samaria and Jerusalem.

Regarding the “anger-exclusion pattern,” the Deuteronomists also confessed that it was the grave sin of the Israelites that caused Moses to be punished. Because Moses did not sin in the incident of the spy story, the phrase “because of your words” (Deut 4:21) follows the clause “YHWH was angry with me” in the speech of Moses. This phrase clarifies that Moses was innocent. The divine anger and punishment on Moses was *not irrational*. Moses was excluded from the Promised Land because of the sin of the first exodus generation.

The “anger-exclusion pattern” of Moses is compared with different “anger-punishment patterns” of Israelites in Deut 4. In Deut 4:21-28, the “anger-exclusion pattern” of Moses connects with the “anger-destruction pattern” and the “anger-exile pattern” of the Israelites. The exclusion of Moses, which is caused by the anger of God, is compared with the destruction and dispersion of the future generations which are also initiated by the provocation of divine anger. The sin of the first generation of Israelites is alluded in Deut 4:21, while the sin of the future generations of Israelites is mentioned in Deut 4:23-28. These two mentions of the sin of the Israelites are like the “*inclusio*” of the Israelites. The Deuteronomists confessed that the Israelites were a sinful people since the *first* generation who left Egypt to the *last* generation during the fall of Jerusalem. They confessed that they were people who deserved the wrath of YHWH.

We have suggested that Deut 1-3 has a dual role as the introductory chapters to the book of Deuteronomy and the historical introduction to the Deuteronomistic

History. Therefore, the “anger-exclusion pattern” of Moses in Deut 1-3 can be also understood in the scheme of the “anger-punishment pattern” of the Deuteronomistic work.

The “anger-exclusion pattern” in Deut 1-3

	Cause of Divine Anger	Word for Divine Anger	Word for Exclusion
Deut 1:37	בגללכם (“on your account”)	אָנף (Hiph)	לֹא (Qal) with בּוֹא
Deut 3:26-27	למענכם (“for your sake”)	עבר (Hiph)	לֹא (Qal) with עבר

The “anger-exclusion pattern” of Moses appears in the frame of Deut 1-3. The first occurrence of it is at the beginning of Deut 1 in the spy narrative; while the other one can be found at the end of Deut 3 where Moses retold his prayer to God. It can be noted that “the sin of Moses” is also absent, while we can find the expressions “on your account” and “for your sake” are always attached to divine wrath. Thus there is a replacement of the cause of divine anger in the “anger-exclusion pattern” of Moses. Hence, like Deut 4:21-22, the “anger-exclusion pattern” of Moses can highlight the sin of the Israelites and the innocence of Moses.

Another important element in the “anger-exclusion pattern” of Moses in Deut 1:37 is that the verb אָנף is used for divine anger. This verb coheres with the concluding chapter of the Deuteronomistic work in 2 Kgs 17, in where YHWH was very angry (אָנף) with Israel and removed them out of his sight. Thus, the wrath of YHWH against Moses is a prelude to the end of Israel in the Deuteronomistic

History.⁵²

3. Conclusion

In conclusion we may briefly review the two main sections which we have been discussing. The first section attempts to show that in Deut 4 Moses's exclusion is compared to the destruction and scattering of the future generations of the Israelites who provoked God to anger. Moses was excluded because of divine anger and the sin of the first generation. The future generations would be destroyed and scattered because of their own sin which provoked YHWH to anger.

In the second section, we propose the scheme of the "anger-punishment pattern" to integrate Dennis McCarthy's "wrath formulae" and Norbert Lohfink's "exile formula." We place the "anger-exclusion pattern" of Moses as one of the sub-groups. The Deuteronomists confess the sin of the Israelites by using the "anger-destruction pattern" and the "anger-exile pattern" which explain that the sin of idolatry and evil actions of the people (and the kings) provoked YHWH to anger, which caused the fall of Samaria and Jerusalem. Regarding the "anger-exclusion pattern," we propose that the replacement of the sin of the Israelites by "because of your words," "on your account" and "for your sake" may indicate a clarification of the innocence of Moses, and an affirmation of the sin of the Israelites. The Deuteronomists confessed that it

⁵² Thomas Römer, "Das deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk und die Wüstentraditionen der Hebräischen Bibel," in *Das deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk* (ed. Hermann-Josef Stipp; ÖBS 39; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2011), 74.

was the grave sin of the people that caused the innocent Moses to be punished. Such a pattern forces the Israelites to look at the severity of their sin that even the innocent one would be affected. Hence, divine anger and the exclusion of Moses work together in the “anger-punishment pattern” to bring out the principle of divine work in history. Not all the mentions of the exclusion of Moses are interpreted by the divine anger tradition. We will look at them in the next two chapters.

Chapter Six. The sin of Moses in Num 20 and Num 27

Before we come to the post-Priestly text of Deut 32:48-52, it is necessary first to interpret Num 20:1-13 and 27:12-14 because Deut 32:48-52 depends on the traditions of these two passages. In this chapter we will try to give an interpretation of the sin of Moses in Num 20:1-13. Then, we will seek to explain the change of the description of the sin of Moses and Aaron in Num 27:14.

1. The sin of Moses in Num 20

Moses and Aaron were not allowed to lead the people into the Promised Land after the incident of waters of Meribah. The story (Num 20:1-13) can be divided into five sections:¹

- | | |
|------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) 20:1 | Itinerary formula (with the death of Miriam) |
| 2) 20:2a | Exposition |
| 3) 20:2b-5 | Complication (crisis and speech report) |
| 4) 20:6-12 | Resolution (narration, speech report, execution of instruction and speech report) |
| 5) 20:13 | Concluding etiology |

The first verse of Num 20 does not give a direct cause or connection to the plot of the

¹ Knierim and Coats, *Numbers*, 225-226.

narrative but it has two implicit linkages to the chapter as a whole. One of which is the place “Kadesh.” This chapter begins with the record that the people stayed at Kadesh (Num 20:1). Then, Num 20:14 starts another narrative which also occurred at Kadesh from where Moses sent messengers. In Num 20:16, the message of Moses also mentions Kadesh. After the Israelites were rejected by Edom, they set out from Kadesh and came to Mount Hor (Num 20:22). The second linkage of Num 20:1 to the chapter itself is the mention of the death of Miriam.² In Num 20:28-29 Aaron’s death is also mentioned. Aaron’s death echoes Miriam’s death. Thus, Num 20 can be read as depicting the fate of the three siblings: all of them could not enter or live in the Promised Land. (Miriam [Num 20:1], Aaron [Num 20:12, 24-29] and Moses [Num 20:12]).

Num 20:2-5 describes the complaints of the people where verse 2 states the *cause* of the complaints, and verses 3-5 the *content* of the complaints. Their complaints do not start with water but begin with two occurrences of the root נָוַע (“perished”)³ followed by two לָמָּה (“why”) questions.⁴ The people had mentioned

² Marvin Sweeney suggests that Moses “is denied entry into the Promised land when he commits sin at the rock of Meribah, most likely because he and Aaron did not purify themselves following the burial of their sister Miriam.” See Marvin A. Sweeney, “Moses,” *OEBT* 2: 115. However, Sweeney’s suggestion is not supported by any reason.

³ *HALOT* 1: 184.

⁴ The most important address to the problem of “no water to drink” occurs only at the end of the complaints. The motif of “death” in Num 20:1 recurs in Num 20:3-4. When the Israelites contended with Moses, they wished that they had *perished* when their brothers *perished* before YHWH. And they feared whether they would *die* in the wilderness. The two לָמָּה (“why”) questions ask the purpose of the journey. The first question asks, “Why have you *brought* (בָּרָא Hiphil)...into this wilderness?” The second question is, “Why have you made us come up out of Egypt to *bring* (בָּרָא Hiphil) us to this evil place?” They thought that the wilderness was “evil” (Num 20:5) and was the destination of the journey, that it was a place for them and their beasts to die (Num 20:4). They forgot that they should be brought into the land which YHWH had given to them (Num 20:12). They had focused on the things they lacked, i.e., grain, figs, vines, pomegranates and water (Num 20:5).

YHWH two times,⁵ however, they did not find any hope or solution from YHWH. They had lost the aim and the meaning of the journey. In Num 20:6, Moses and Aaron left the assembly and went to the tent of meeting. They responded to the people's complaints not verbally but by a gesture, falling on their faces to the doorway of the tent of meeting. After that, the text reads: the glory of YHWH appeared to Moses and Aaron.

In Num 20:7-8 YHWH instructed Moses and Aaron with five verbs, each verb has its object. The instructions given by YHWH are very clear and provide a solution to the problem of water shortage. Then, Moses performed five actions. It seems that Aaron only performed one action with Moses: the assembling of the people (Num 20:10). Finally, the problem was solved (Num 20:9-11).

In Num 20:12, YHWH judged that Moses and Aaron had not believed in him because they have performed some actions which were not instructed by YHWH. By doing so, they had not regarded YHWH as holy before the Israelites. Thus, Moses and Aaron could not bring the assembly into the Promised Land. The concluding etiology in Num 20:13 recounts that the holiness of YHWH is retained.⁶ The name of the place, the waters of Meribah, means that the Israelites had contended with YHWH.⁷ Moses and Aaron were punished and excluded from the Promised Land.

⁵ Their brothers had "perished before YHWH" (Num 20:3) and they were "the assembly of YHWH" (Num 20:4)

⁶ Baentsch believes that YHWH sanctified himself by the pronouncement of the judgment of Moses and Aaron. See Baentsch, *Numeri*, 570. Seebass argues that the "them" in the "through them" may be "the Israelites" because it is the closer object of the suffix. See Seebass, *Numeri 10,11-22,1*, 283.

⁷ In v. 3, it is Moses whom the Israelites had contended with, but now in v. 13, the Israelites contended with Yhwh.

What is the sin of Moses?

(a) Actions of Moses contrast with Num 20:8

The sin of Moses has been disputed at great length.⁸ To approach the problem of the sin of Moses, it is necessary to clarify whether the sin is in the action or in the word, whether the sin is in one action or more than one action, and whether we should restrict the sin to be one action only. Some scholars attempt to solve the problem by finding one fault of Moses. But it is not necessary to restrict to only one sin. According to the narrative of Num 20:1-13, Aaron and Moses performed different actions and not both of them have spoken the words, but both of them received the same punishment. It illustrates that different actions and words will give rise to the same description of sin and same punishment in this case. Thus, the punishment is due to different actions (more than one). The sin can be in the action and in the words as well. It seems that it is not a choice of “either – or.” There should be more than one action signifying the sins of Moses and Aaron. Hence, we may accept all the reasonable possibilities rather than just give one probable solution to the issue.

Then, how can we *begin* to solve the problem? The context of the text itself

⁸ Among many accounts of the systematic classification of opinions, see Milgrom, “Magic,” 251-265; Johnson T. K. Lim, *Staff of God*, 109-133; Katharine Doob Sakenfeld, “Theological and Redactional Problems in Numbers 20.2-13,” in *Understanding the Word* (JSOTSup 37; ed. J. T. Butler et al.; Sheffield: Sheffield, 1985), 133-154. Katharine Sakenfeld does not classify the opinions into different categories, but she has given a review of the studies of six scholars: Carl Cornill, Fujiko Kohata, Geroge Coats, M. Margalith, Eugene Arden and Nobert Lohfink.

gives a clue: in Num 20:8 YHWH commanded Moses and Aaron five actions: “take the staff,” “assemble the congregation,” “speak to the rock,” “bring forth water” and “let the congregation drink.” However, later Moses performed five actions: (a) he took the staff; (b) he assembled the people; (c) he spoke to the people; (d) he lifted up his hand; and finally (e) he struck the rock twice. Then YHWH condemned Moses and Aaron. There are differences between the commands of YHWH and the actual carrying out of the commands. Thus, the main faults of Moses can be deduced by comparing Moses’ actions and words with YHWH’s commands.⁹

Comparison of the instructions of YHWH with the actions of Moses and Aaron

Commands in v. 8	Action done by Moses in vv. 9-11	Action done by Moses and Aaron in vv. 9-11	Types of actions
take (singular)	took (v. 9)		i
assemble (singular)		assembled (v.10)	
speak (plural) ¹⁰ to the rock	<i>said to the people (v.10)?</i>	---	ii & iii
bring forth (singular) ¹¹	---	---	ii
let the congregation drink (singular)	---	---	ii
---	lifted up his hand (v.11)		iii
---	struck the rock (v.11)		

⁹ Is the sin deliberately suppressed? There is no evidence to support the view of Eryl Davies, who suggests that there may be a motivation that was to avoid incriminating Moses and Aaron unduly by dwelling on the precise nature of their transgression or the view of Kapelrud, who contends that the author had been deliberately vague about the sin to answer the demands of an explanation why they never came to lead the invasion into the Promised Land. Snaith’s suggestion that the sin had been clearly defined in the original narrative but had been deliberately lost in the editing does not have sufficient ground. The explanation of Schmitt that the author has deliberately suppressed the exact nature of the error of Moses in order to stress the divine pronouncement of Moses’ lack of faith must also be rejected. See Davies, *Numbers*, 206; Kapelrud, “How Tradition failed Moses,” *JBL* 76 (1957): 242; Snaith, “*Numbers*,” 264; Sailhamer, *Pentateuch*, 76.

¹⁰ Sakenfeld also has observed that “take” the staff is singular imperative, while “speak” to the rock is a second person masculine plural. See Sakenfeld, “Problems,” 135.

¹¹ The last two verbs of Num 20:8 are singular in MT but plural in the LXX. See Sakenfeld, “Problems,” 135.

There are three types of actions: (i) actions performed according to the instruction of YHWH; (ii) actions that YHWH had commanded them to do but they had not done; and (iii) actions that had been performed but not instructed by YHWH. In Num 20:9, Moses was simply carrying out God's instruction. He took the staff. The phrase "just as he had commanded him" (Num 20:9) makes this very clear. Then, Moses and Aaron assembled the assembly" (Num 20:10). Although the imperative of the verb "assemble" in Num 20:8 is in the singular form, it is followed by "you (=Moses) and Aaron" immediately. Both Moses and Aaron were ordered to perform the action and they did as they had been told.

The sin of omitting from God's commands

In Num 20:8 the verb דַּבַּרְתֶּם ("you speak") is in plural form. YHWH had ordered both of them to speak to the rock.¹² But only one of them had spoken because the verb וַיֹּאמֶר ("and he said") in Num 20:10 is in the singular. This is the first point in which they disobey YHWH, one of them has not obeyed YHWH's instruction. The second fault is that one of them spoke to a wrong object. They were ordered to speak to the rock, but one of them spoke to the people. Not both of them spoke to the rock, instead, one of them spoke to the Israelites. The identity of the speaker who said to the people in Num 20:10 is ambiguous. The text does not

¹² Coats also makes the point that the two (Moses and Aaron) will be required to speak to the rock. See George W. Coats, *Rebellion in the Wilderness: The Murmuring Motif in the Wilderness Traditions of the Old Testament* (Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1968), 78.

actually specify the speaker,¹³ the subject of the verb “said” can be Moses or Aaron. It is not wrong in saying that Moses was the speaker. It is also how the author of Ps 106:32-33 understands it: “... Moses suffered on their account... and he spoke rashly.” The speaker is taken to be Moses because of “his independent status in other verses” in this passage, and because of the tradition of Ps 106.¹⁴

In Num 20:8, YHWH commanded either Moses or Aaron to bring forth water from the rock. In Num 20:11, “and water came forth” from the rock. The water became an active subject in this sentence. It was not Moses or Aaron who brought forth water from the rock. Also, YHWH instructed that either Moses or Aaron to “let the people drink.” But in Num 20:11 “the congregation and their beasts” are the subjects of the verb “drank.” It was not Moses or Aaron who had performed the instruction given by YHWH.

The sin of lifting up his hand

YHWH had not commanded Moses to lift up his hand but he did so (Num 20:11). Labuschagne states that the gesture has a military connotation (the readiness to fight and the will to prevail) in Exod 14:8 and Num 33:3b; the expression has a weakened meaning, “deliberately,” in Num 15:30.¹⁵ Roy Gane also claims that this is the language of sinning with a “high/ lifted hand,” that is, defiantly.¹⁶ Recently, the studies of Jean-Pierre Sonnet and Ka Leung Wong have given solid reasonings to

¹³ Sakenfeld, “Problems,” 135.

¹⁴ Sakenfeld, “Problems,” 135.

¹⁵ C. J. Labuschagne, “The Meaning of b^ēyād rāmā in the Old Testament,” in *Von Kanaan bis Kerala*. FS J. P. M. van der Ploeg (ed. W. S. Delsman et al.; AOAT 211; Kevelaer, 1982), 143-148.

¹⁶ Roy Gane, *Leviticus, Numbers* (NIVAC; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 2004), 671.

support this view.

Jean-Pierre Sonnet has argued attractively that the sin of Moses is that he deliberately despised the word of YHWH “with raised hand.”¹⁷ Moses knew and was aware of his act of defiance and rebellion against the order given by YHWH.¹⁸ The first basis of Sonnet’s argument is the text of Num 15:30-31. Sonnet believes that the narrator has sent a signal to the readers of the book of Numbers: וירם משה את ידו (“and Moses raised his hand”). This gesture of Moses illustrates the voluntary and deliberate nature of his sin just as the sin of “with raised hand” in Num 15:30-31.¹⁹ The term בִּיד רָמָה in Hebrew adopts a metaphorical language, the raised hand is a sign of defiance.²⁰ The text of Num 15:30-31 also helps to explain the punishment of Moses.²¹ According to which, the punishment to the sinner who sinned with raised hand will be כָּרַת (“to cut off”), he would be removed from the people.²² In Num 20:12 it is said that Moses could not lead the Israelites to the Promised Land. Moses’ fate was different from that of the people.²³ This distinguished fate is the punishment of removal from the people.²⁴ Sonnet agrees with Olivier Artus that the narratives are used to support the laws in the book of

¹⁷ Jean-Pierre Sonnet, “Nb 20,11: Moïse en Flagrant délit de «main levée»?,” in *The Books of Leviticus and Numbers* (ed. Thomas Römer; BETL 215. Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 2008), 535-543.

¹⁸ Sonnet, “Nb 20,11,” 539.

¹⁹ Sonnet, “Nb 20,11,” 539.

²⁰ Sonnet, “Nb 20,11,” 539.

²¹ Sonnet, “Nb 20,11,” 542.

²² Sonnet, “Nb 20,11,” 542.

²³ Sonnet, “Nb 20,11,” 542.

²⁴ Sonnet, “Nb 20,11,” 542.

Numbers.²⁵ So the narrative of Num 20:1-13 is used to lead the readers to the concept of the sin of “with raised hand” in Num 15:30-31.

Sonnet’s second basis is the characterization of Moses in the Pentateuch. From the book of Exodus to Deuteronomy, the body of Moses is linked to the plot of the narratives.²⁶ Thus the lifting up of Moses’ hand gives a sign of the fault of Moses, and points out Moses’ deliberate action and his rebellion against YHWH’s command.²⁷ The line of thought of Sonnet is sensitive to the literary plot of Moses and the relationship between law and narrative in the book of Numbers.

On different grounds, Ka Leung Wong also proposes a persuasive suggestion that the raising of Moses’ hand constitutes at least part of the sin of Moses. By comparing to the passages of the Exodus version of the waters of Meribah (Exod 17:1-7) and the plague narrative (Exod 7-10), Wong argues that when the text talks about striking with the staff, the preceding action is either the stretching out of the hand or the staff, but never the raising of the hand or the staff.²⁸ Examining all the occurrences of the texts in which **רָמָה** is used with **יָד**, Wong notices that eight of the occurrences all underline the various human subjects’ attitude, their readiness to fight and their will to prevail.²⁹ So the phrase **בִּיד רָמָה** is a demonstration of their own power to prevail against a hostile and even superior force.³⁰ Consequently, the

²⁵ Sonnet, “Nb 20,11,” 542-43.

²⁶ Sonnet, “Nb 20,11,” 540.

²⁷ Sonnet, “Nb 20,11,” 540.

²⁸ Ka Leung Wong, “‘And Moses raised his hand’ in Numbers 20,11,” *Biblica* 89 (2008): 398.

²⁹ Wong, “And Moses,” 399.

³⁰ Wong, “And Moses,” 399.

gesture of “raising one’s hand” is “not to be interpreted literally, but figuratively as representing his attitude, a demonstration of his own power to fight against a hostile and superior force before him.”³¹ By reference of Num 14:9 and 11, the implied superior force is God.³² Since Moses regards God as his enemy, he rebels against God by not following His command to speak to the rock.³³ Therefore, there are good grounds for supposing that the raising of hand of Moses is one of his faults. However, the view taken here is that the lifting up of the hand is not the only sin involved. Only Moses had lifted up his hand, Aaron had not, but both of them were punished. If the raising of hand was the only sin, Aaron would not be punished because he did not commit such sin.³⁴

The sin of striking the rock

In Num 20:8, YHWH also ordered Moses and Aaron to speak to the rock, but Moses struck the rock (Num 20:11). This striking was not only unnecessary but also repeated. Many scholars agree that the sin is in the striking of the rock instead of speaking to the rock.³⁵ The striking of the rock replaces the speaking to it, such

³¹ Wong, “And Moses,” 400.

³² Wong, “And Moses,” 400.

³³ Wong, “And Moses,” 400.

³⁴ If Moses’ sin is indicated by the raising of his hand, Aaron’s sin should be indicated by other actions. Since both of Aaron and Moses did not perform three tasks instructed by YHWH (speaking to the rock, bringing forth water, and letting the congregation drink), Aaron himself would not be innocent in this incident.

³⁵ Elliott-Binns, *Numbers*, 132; Dozeman, “Numbers,” 160; H. Holzinger, *Numeri* (KHCAT 4; Tübingen ; Leipzig : J.C.B. Mohr, 1903), 85; Knierim and Coats, *Numbers*, 228; Mays, *Numbers*, 110; Scharbert, *Numeri*, 80; H. Schneider, *Numeri* (Würzburg: Echter, 1952), 53; de Vaulx, *Nombres*, 226; Wenham, *Numbers*, 150; Wong, *Numbers*, 250.

replacement is the mistake of Moses.³⁶ Therefore, the replacement of speaking to the rock is a denial of God's word.

However, Jacob Milgrom does not think that the action of striking the rock is the sin of Moses. Instead, he thinks this action is necessary. Milgrom's conclusion is based on the following observations and reasons. First, Milgrom quotes Ramban's comment that Moses was told to take the staff in Num 20:8. When the staff is "employed, striking is either specifically mentioned or implied."³⁷ Second, the Israelites did not know the command of speaking to the rock which YHWH specially told Moses. Their previous experience in Exod 17 would have led them to expect Moses to strike the rock. Consequently, when they saw that Moses struck the rock, they "could not be aware" that YHWH was not regarded as holy in the sight of them.³⁸ Third, Exod 17 and Num 20 are records of the same account, this is based on the following grounds. Most critics posit Exod 17 and Num 20 as two variant accounts for the same incident because there are remarkable parallels in both context and style.³⁹ In addition, Bekhor Shor, a medieval Jewish exegete, also postulates Num 20 as a duplication of Exod 17 because he notices that the story about the manna, the quail, and the waters from the rock each occur twice, once in Exodus and once in Numbers.⁴⁰ Moreover, according to Deut 33:8, Massah and Meribah must refer to the same incident because they are in the poetic parallel clauses. The text of

³⁶ Seebass, *Numeri 10,11-22,1*, 282.

³⁷ Milgrom, "Magic," 253.

³⁸ Milgrom, "Magic," 253.

³⁹ Milgrom, "Magic," 254.

⁴⁰ Milgrom, "Magic," 254.

Ps 78:15-31 and Deut 9:22 also support such possibility.⁴¹ Furthermore, in Num 20:13 the place is called “waters of Meribah, meaning that the Israelites quarreled with YHWH.” Such wording also occurs in Exod 17:7.⁴² Therefore, observing that Moses was ordered to strike the rock in the Exod 17 version, and assuming that Exod 17 and Num 20 are variants of the same incident, Milgrom deduces that Moses was also ordered to strike the rock in the Numeri version originally. Hence, the “striking on the rock” is a fulfillment of the command.

But, why is there a command of “speaking to the rock” in Num 20:8?

According to Milgrom, the term “and speak” was incorrectly inserted. He reconstructs the original text of Num 20:8a to be:

The original text of Num 20:8 according to Milgrom	
קח את המטה	“Take the staff
והקהל את העדה	and assemble the congregation
אתה ואהרן אחיך	you and Aaron, your brother
אל הסלע	to the rock
והכיתם את הסלע	and strike the rock (lost)
לעיניהם	before their eyes,
ונתן מימיו	and it may yield its water.

He suggests that the original text of Num 20:8a contained the command “strike the rock.”⁴³ This clause fell out accidentally because of “homoioteleuton.”⁴⁴ Later, “and speak” was *incorrectly* inserted because Moses did speak and the promise of giving

⁴¹ Milgrom, “Magic,” 254.

⁴² Milgrom, “Magic,” 255.

⁴³ Milgrom, “Magic,” 256.

⁴⁴ The phenomena of “homoioteleuton” (“identical ending”) refers to the erroneous omission of a section influenced by repetition of one or more words in the same context in an identical way or similar way. See Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 238.

out water was fulfilled.⁴⁵

Text of Num 20:8 after the insertion of “and speak”	
קח את המטה	8 “Take the staff
והקהל את העדה	and assemble the congregation
אתה ואהרן אחיך	you and Aaron, your brother
ודברתם	and speak (inserted)
אל הסלע	to the rock
לעיניהם	before their eyes,
ונתן מימיו	and it may yield its water.

Milgrom’s suggestion faces two serious obstacles. In the first place, Milgrom’s point that the Israelites expect Moses to strike the rock because of their previous experience and the assumption that Exod 17 and Num 20 are records of the same incident are incompatible. If Exod 17 and Num 20 are duplicate accounts of the same tradition, Exod 17 would not be the previous experience of the Israelites. If the incident of the waters from the rock occurred only once, the Israelites would not expect Moses to strike the rock.

Second, Milgrom’s reconstruction of the text of Num 20:8a requires the coincidence of *both* the homoioteleuton of the clause “and strike the rock” and the incorrect insertion of “and speak.” There is no textual evidence for his hypothesis. If there is an understanding that Moses and all the prophets perform the miracles in silence as a contradistinction to pagan magic, it is hard to believe that the later scribe would insert “and speak” in the command of God. The later scribe did not necessarily see that the fulfillment of the miracle is related to Moses’ saying. it is,

⁴⁵ Milgrom, “Magic,” 256.

therefore, unlikely that the striking of the rock is necessary, rather it is one of the sins of Moses.

Another suggestion that Moses had misused the staff when he struck the rock,⁴⁶ may be correct. The staff is called “the staff of God” (Exod 4:20). The staff of God in Moses’ hand “profiles Moses as the representative of God.”⁴⁷ Johnson Lim has drawn attention to that only YHWH has the prerogative to decide how the staff is to be used; using the staff of God to strike the rock without authorization was an act of defiance.⁴⁸ Hence, the misuse of the staff is also a sin of Moses.

(b) Words of Moses

Besides the actions, the sin(s) may lie in the speech of Num 20:10.⁴⁹ The sin of Moses and Aaron is that they have not served as instruments of God’s blessing by their “rash words,” instead they have implied doubt of God’s plan to help the people, perhaps doubted their role as instruments, or even have wanted to withhold from the people the goodness God has promise to give.⁵⁰ The sin is a lack of trust impeding God’s mercy to the community.⁵¹ There are three ways to understand the words of Moses:⁵² (a) An open-ended question: “shall we bring forth water?” (b) A question

⁴⁶ Lim, *Staff of God*, 162.

⁴⁷ Lim, *Staff of God*, 162.

⁴⁸ Lim, *Staff of God*, 163.

⁴⁹ Ashley, *Numbers*, 384-385; Budd, *Numbers*, 218-219; Dozeman, “Numbers,” 160-161; Mays, *Numbers*, 110; Dennis T. Olson, *Numbers* (Interpretation; Louisville, Ky.: John Knox Press, 1996), 126-127; Wenham, *Numbers*, 150-151.

⁵⁰ Sakenfeld, “Problems,” 149.

⁵¹ Sakenfeld, “Problems,” 151.

⁵² Sakenfeld, “Problems,” 148.

expecting a negative answer: “Can we bring forth water?” (c) A rhetorical question to express a refusal to produce the water: “Shall we indeed.../ Why shall we bring forth water?” It has been pointed out that the unfaithful content of the question itself would lead to the judgment of God.⁵³ In Ps 106:32-33 it is claimed that Moses spoke rash words, and this supports the view that the speech of Num 20:10b is the root of the problem.⁵⁴ The speech is uncalled for, and implies a claim that they, not God, will produce the water. In its arrogance it fails to foster true belief in and reverence for YHWH.⁵⁵

It would be wrong to suppose that the sin of Moses is that he said something before the rock-striking action which originally should be performed in silence.⁵⁶ According to Milgrom, such silent performance of miracle can contrast sharply with the pagan magic (Egypt and Mesopotamian).⁵⁷ When Moses spoke to the rock, the Israelites would have taken “his words as an incantation and him as a magician” who performed the miracle by his own power rather than by “divine agency.”⁵⁸ We have argued that there is no strong basis for such suggestion.

However, Milgrom’s other point is still useful. When Moses said, “shall we...” (Num 20:10), the “we” does not include God because there was no visible evidence

⁵³ Sakenfeld, “Problems,” 148-149.

⁵⁴ Philip J. Budd, *Numbers*, (WBC; Dallas, Texas: Word, 1984.), 219.

⁵⁵ Budd, *Numbers*, 219. However, Sakenfeld states that Ps 106 represents one view of the matter, but even its statement is not explicit in identifying Moses’ speaking as sin. See Sakenfeld, “Problems,” 147.

⁵⁶ Milgrom, “Magic,” 262.

⁵⁷ Milgrom, “Magic,” 260, 264.

⁵⁸ Milgrom, “Magic,” 261.

of God's presence on the rock.⁵⁹ Hence Moses implied that the miracle was his miracle, not God's.⁶⁰ Moses attributed the miracle power to himself.⁶¹ This is a denial of God's essence.⁶² In such denial, Moses and Aaron missed the chance to sanctify God.⁶³ Nili Fox also points out that the medieval commentators have focused on the pronoun "we" in "shall we bring water" in the speech. By attributing the act of drawing water from a rock to himself and Aaron, Moses fails to credit the miracle to YHWH before the Israelites.⁶⁴

To summarise: the sin of Moses can be found in Num 20:10. The speaking itself was a sin or the rash words were faults. His sin can also be found in Num 20:11. The lifting up of Moses' hand has both literary and symbolic meaning. Such symbolic meaning expresses that Moses defiantly despises YHWH's command. The raising of Moses hand alludes to the "high hand" in Num 15:30-31, which speaks about a man deliberately disobeys the word of YHWH. He misused the staff, and rather than speaking to the rock, he struck it.

2. The loss of leadership of Moses in Num 20

Before discussing the meaning of the disbelief of Moses and Aaron, it is

⁵⁹ In Exod 17:6 YHWH said that He would be standing on the rock.

⁶⁰ Milgrom, "Magic," 257.

⁶¹ Milgrom, "Magic," 264.

⁶² Milgrom, "Magic," 258.

⁶³ Milgrom, "Magic," 258. Seebass disagrees with Milgrom that Moses acted magically when Moses spoke something during the performance of the miracle. Such interpretation, according to Seebass, is a "read-in" interpretation. See Seebass, *Numeri 10,11-22,1*, 282.

⁶⁴ Nili S. Fox, "Numbers," in *The Jewish Study Bible* (2d ed.; ed. A. Berlin and Marc Z. Brettler; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 308.

necessary to settle the issues brought out by David Frankel and Herbert Specht recently. Frankel brings out a textual issue in Num 20:12. He points out that the infinitive construction לְהַקְדִּישֵׁנִי (“to sanctify me”) did not exist in the original form of the text.⁶⁵ According to him, the infinitive construction is supplemented by a redactor to “did not believe in God.” He thinks that Num 20:12 has been expanded by a short interpretive gloss “to regard me as holy before the eyes of the Israelites” because of four reasons: (a) The second half of Num 27:14 and Deut 32:51 seem to be secondary. Since Num 20:12 is the parallel text of Num 27:14 and Deut 32:51, the verse is suspected to be a late gloss.⁶⁶ (b) Frankel thinks that usually an author uses only one term to present the same thing. Two different terms are used to describe the people of Israel: “sons of Israel” and “this assembly.”⁶⁷ (c) The sin of Moses and Aaron “seems overloaded.” It remains unclear “where the weight of the sin lies – in the lack of trust in God or in the failure to sanctify.”⁶⁸ (d) The implication that Moses and Aaron failed to sanctify God “flies in the face of verse 13,” which clearly states “and He sanctified himself through them.” Since verse 13 is not a late supplement, then verse 12 is.⁶⁹

Frankel’s arguments are not convincing. First, Frankel assumes that the original version must be clearer and simpler than the one with supplements. He finds that there are difficulties in the second half of verse 12. Then he deduces that these

⁶⁵ Frankel, *Murmuring*, 273.

⁶⁶ Frankel, *Murmuring*, 271-272.

⁶⁷ Frankel, *Murmuring*, 272.

⁶⁸ Frankel, *Murmuring*, 272-273.

⁶⁹ Frankel, *Murmuring*, 273.

difficulties are produced by the “interpretive gloss.” When the gloss is removed, the original meaning is much clearer. According to Frankel’s assumption, the supplementary gloss of the redactor does not really help to *interpret* the sentence. It causes more hard sayings. It seems that the redactor did not know that his gloss is a problem but Frankel does. However, one may ask why the redactor will make something more difficult to understand although his original intention is to interpret something. Could we assume that the redactor was also aware of the problem? It is not necessary to assume that the inconsistencies are caused by the redactor since most redactors would try to avoid the inconsistencies caused by his editorial activity. It is also unnecessary to reconstruct an “imposed original form” of the verse to interpret the difficulties in Num 20:12.

Second, regarding the two different terms used to mention the people of Israel (“the sons of Israel” and the “assembly”), it is not necessary to assume that an author can use only one term. Three terms, in fact, can be found to represent the Israelites in this paragraph. The term “assembly” has been used four times (Num 20:4, 6, 10 and 12). “The congregation” has been used five times (Num 20:1, 2, 8[2×] and 11). The term “the sons of Israel/ the Israelites” occurs in verses 1, 12 and 13. Third, “the sin of Moses and Aaron seems to be overloaded” does not necessarily point to an “interpretive gloss.” There is no “standard” for us to measure whether a sin is overloaded. Fourth, there is not an “either-or” choice between verse 12 and verse 13.

Frankel says that the claims that verse 13 is a late supplement “are baseless.”⁷⁰ Then he deduces that the second half of verse 12 is a late gloss. Such “either-or” relationship may be also baseless. One would not know why one of the two verses should be later. There is no contradiction between verse 12 and verse 13 if we read the text that God was not regarded as holy *before*, but He sanctified Himself *after* He announced the punishment to Moses and Aaron. Consequently, it is not necessary to separate “believing in God” and “regarding God as holy.” Instead we can confirm that there is a relationship between them.

On the issue of the source of Num 20:12, Herbert Specht proposes that the Priestly author cites Isaiah 7:9 in Num 20:12.⁷¹ His grounds include four points. First, the verb אָמַן (“to believe”) is not used by P elsewhere.⁷² Second, there are parallels in details between Isaiah 7:9 and Num 20:12. The first parallel is that both verses are YHWH’s words to the leaders (to King Ahaz [Isa 7:9]; to Moses and Aaron [Num 20:12]).⁷³ The second parallel is that in both passages YHWH gives His salvation but the leaders could not receive it. In Isaiah 7:7-9 “Ahaz will not remain”⁷⁴ although YHWH promises that the plan of Aram and Ephraim should not succeed, while in Num 20:11-12 Moses and Aaron would not enter the land though

⁷⁰ Frankel, *Murmuring*, 273.

⁷¹ Herbert Specht, “Die Verfehlung Moses und Aarons in Num 20,1-13*P,” in *Torah and the Book of Numbers* (FATII/62; ed. Christian Frevel, T. Pola and A. Scharf; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 273-313.

⁷² Specht, “Die Verfehlung,” 308.

⁷³ Specht, “Die Verfehlung,” 309.

⁷⁴ Specht, “Die Verfehlung,” 309.

YHWH has given the land and water to the people.⁷⁵ Third, the Priestly writing has cited other prophetic speeches.⁷⁶ Fourth, according to Specht, Thomas Pola's comparison of Ezek 20 with P that Ezek 20 has an impact on the development and formation of the primary and secondary Priestly materials.⁷⁷ Hence Specht believes that Num 20:12 is a deliberate allusion to Isaiah 7:9.⁷⁸

Regarding the expression with an infinitive in **להקדישני** in Num 20:12, Specht thinks that P can use this word because "sanctuary" and "to sanctify" are important parts of his interpretation of the world.⁷⁹ Specht sees Num 20:12 is also a citation of Ezek 20:41 because Specht accepts Pola's study that there is a strong relationship between Ezek 20 and P.⁸⁰

Specht's reasonings of the citation of Isaiah 7:9 are not convincing. First, the syntax of Isaiah 7:9 and Num 20:12 is very different so that Num 20:12 is not quoting Isaiah 7:9. Isaiah 7:9 is an "if" clause with an imperfect (or yiqtol) verb, while Num 20:12 is a "because" clause with a perfect (or qatal) verb:

Isaiah 7:9	Isaiah 7:9
אם לא תאמינו	If you will not believe,
כי לא תאמנו	you shall not be settled.

Num 20:12	Num 20:12
יען לא האמנתם בי...	"Because you have not believed in me...
לכן לא תביאו את הקהל הזה אל הארץ	therefore, you shall not bring this

⁷⁵ Specht, "Die Verfehlung," 309.

⁷⁶ Specht, "Die Verfehlung," 309.

⁷⁷ Specht, "Die Verfehlung," 309.

⁷⁸ Specht, "Die Verfehlung," 309.

⁷⁹ Specht, "Die Verfehlung," 309.

⁸⁰ Specht, "Die Verfehlung," 309.

In Isaiah 7:9 the disbelief is in the subordinate conditional clause, and has not occurred yet, while in Num 20:12 Moses and Aaron have already committed the “not believing.” Even if P has quoted the prophetic speeches in other passages, it does not prove that P has also quoted Isaiah 7:9 in Num 20:12. Furthermore, the proposal that Ezek 20 has a great impact on P does not support that Isaiah 7:9 also has an impact on Num 20:12.

Besides, there are also great differences between Ezek 20 and Num 20:12. In Ezek 20:41 the verb קדש (“to sanctify”) is in Niphal stem and used with a divine subject, but in Num 20:12 the infinitive of the verb קדש is in Hiphil stem with implied human subjects (Moses and Aaron). In addition, the phrase לעיני בני ישראל (“before the eyes of the Israelites”) in Num 20:12 has a different meaning from that of לעיני הגוים (“before the eyes of the nations”) in Ezek 20:41. Therefore it seems that it is very unlikely that Num 20:12 is quoting Isaiah 7:9 and Ezek 20:41.

The meaning of disbelief in God in Num 20:12

In Num 20:12 the verb אמן is in the Hiphil stem. The verb אמן occurs three times in the book of Numbers, six times in the book of Deuteronomy and a total of ninety-seven times in the Hebrew Bible. In Num 14:11 and 20:12, אמן means “to believe.” In Num 12:7, אמן is used as a participle, qualifying Moses, and can be translated as “is faithful.”

The observation that Num 20:12 is linked to Num 14:11 by the same verb אָמַן describing the sin they have committed is not satisfactory.⁸¹ According to Olivier Artus, the sin of Moses and Aaron is comparable to that of the first exodus generation in Num 14. Therefore they deserved a similar punishment.⁸² However, Artus' treatment on the linkage between the disbelief in God and the exclusion of Moses is not convincing enough. The nuance between the two disbeliefs in Num 14 and 20 should be noticed. According to the context of Num 14, the Israelites did not believe that YHWH could bring them into the land (Num 14:3), while in Num 20 Moses and Aaron did not believe that speaking to the rock could bring out the water. Besides, the relationship between the punishment and the disbelief is also different in these two narratives. In the spy narrative the Israelites did not believe that they could receive the land from God, so YHWH did not give the land to them. This punishment in Num 14 is measured according to their disbelief. Thus, it is punished according to the principle of "measure for measure." However, the disbelief of Moses and Aaron in Num 20 is not about the land, but about the command of speaking to the rock. Such command is not so relevant to the Promised Land. Thus, the punishment of Moses and Aaron is not measured according to their disbelief. Hence, the connection between the exclusion of Moses and disbelief in God has not been solved by Artus' suggestion.

⁸¹ Olivier Artus, *Etudes sur le livre des Nombres: Récit, Histoire et Loi en Nb 13, 1-20*, 13 (OBO 157; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997), 238.

⁸² Artus, *Etudes*, 238.

Ludwig Schmidt's interpretation is useful. He says that Moses and Aaron did not trust in YHWH that the rock will give out water by their words.⁸³ Therefore, they did not speak to the rock.⁸⁴ Moses doubted this power, so in Num 20:10 he asked the people whether this miracle would be possible. He struck the rock twice because he wanted to show that he could not bring the water out from the rock. He wanted to demonstrate his "powerlessness." Thus, Schmidt has explained why such sin is said to be "not believing in God."

How is the Hiphil of the verb אָמַן used in the Hebrew Bible? Alfred Jepsen has surveyed the interpretations of eight scholars on this verb, and he finds that there is a wide range of meanings among the scholars.⁸⁵ The range is from the idea of "making one sure" to that of "having stability oneself."⁸⁶ The Hiphil of אָמַן is not very often used in the Prophets and the Psalms, but it does appear frequently in the narratives of Israel's early history and in the Wisdom Literature.⁸⁷ From a survey of the usage of the Hiphil of אָמַן in the word's own context, Jepsen concludes that the Hiphil of אָמַן contains primarily a statement about the subject which gains confidence, mostly with reference to a person or a message.⁸⁸ He suggests the best paraphrases of the meaning of the Hiphil of אָמַן are "to gain stability, to rely on

⁸³ Ludwig Schmidt, *Das vierte Buch Mose, Numeri Kapitel 10,11-36,13* (DATD 7/2; Gottingen : Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 92-93.

⁸⁴ Schmidt, *Numeri*, 93.

⁸⁵ Alfred Jepsen, "אָמַן," *TDOT* 1:298-299. The range is wide because the scholars arrive at the different meanings by different methods: etymology, different understandings of the meaning of the Hiphil stem, and different assessments of the concept of faith in the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament.

⁸⁶ Jepsen, *TDOT* 1:299.

⁸⁷ Jepsen, *TDOT* 1:300.

⁸⁸ Jepsen, *TDOT* 1:307.

someone, to give credence to message or to consider it to be true, to trust in

someone.”⁸⁹ Jepsen thinks that in Num 20:12 Moses and Aaron did not believe that

⁸⁹ Jepsen, “אמן,” 308. In Num 20:12, the object of the Hiphil of אמן is God. The verb אמן (Hiphil) with divine object can be found also in Num 14:11, Deut 1:32, 2Kgs 17:14 and Ps 78:22. In Num 20:12, the subjects of the verb אמן are Moses and Aaron, but in Num 14:11, Deut 1:32, 2Kgs 17:14 and Ps 78:22, the subject of the verb אמן is the first Exodus generation. The following analysis will show that the usages of the verb אמן in these four texts (Num 14:11, Deut 1:32, 2Kgs 17:14 and Ps 78:22) are different.

Condition	Object with preposition	Verb	Subject	Text
	בי	לא־האִמְנָתָם	“You” = Moses and Aaron	Num 20:12
	in me	did not believe		
בכל האִתּוֹת	בי	לא־אִמְיִנוּ	הָעָם הַזֶּה	Num 14:11
in all the signs	in me	did not believe	this people = the first Exodus generation of the Israelites	
וּבְדִבְרֵי הַזֶּה	בַּיהוָה	אִינְכֶם מֹאמִינִים	“You” = the first Exodus generation of the Israelites	Deut 1:32
in this word	in Yhwh	did not believe		
	בַּיהוָה	לֹא הָאִמְיִנוּ	אֲבוֹתָם	2Kgs 17:14
	in Yhwh	did not believe	The fathers of Israelites = the first Exodus generation of the Israelites	
	בֵּאלֹהִים	לֹא הָאִמְיִנוּ	Jacob and Israel in Ps 78:21 = the first Exodus generation of the Israelites	Ps 78:22
	in God	did not believe		

According to Num 14:11, YHWH was disappointed that the people did not believe in him although he had done a lot of signs among them. My understanding of the text is the people did not believe that YHWH could bring them into the Promised land. The people even wanted to kill Caleb and Joshua, the two faithful and brave spies, who said that YHWH would bring them into the land (Num 14:8). In this case, the subject of אמן (Hiphil) is the first Exodus generation. Wildberger notices that the usage of this verb in Num 14:11 is specific: believing in God has become “an acknowledgement of His wonders.” See Wildberger, “אמן,” *TLOT* 1:145.

In the context of Deut 1:32, Moses retold the spy story to the second Exodus generation. He told them when the first Exodus Israelites were afraid that they would be destroyed in the hand of the Amorites, Moses encouraged them by saying that God would fight for them (Deut 1:30) and God had carried them as a father carried a son in the wilderness (Deut 1:31). Even after the first Exodus Israelites had heard Moses' message, they still did not believe in God (Deut 1:32). It may mean that the Israelites did not believe that God would fight for them as mentioned in Deut 1:30. It may also mean that they did not believe that God would continue to carry them as mentioned in Deut 1:31. In addition, they did not believe that God will go before them as mentioned in Deut 1:33. Although the object of their disbelief is clear, the content of their disbelief is ambiguous.

In 2Kgs 17:14, the subject of אמן is אֲבוֹתָם (“the fathers”) of the Israelites. אֲבוֹתָם occurs only three times in 2Kgs. (2 Kgs 17:14, 15; 21:15) The other two occurrences point to the first Exodus generation. In the context of 2Kgs 17:13-15, “the/your fathers” received the commandments and laws of YHWH (2 Kgs 17:13) and had made a covenant with YHWH (2 Kgs 17:15). If “the/your fathers” in 2 Kgs 17:14 refers to the Exodus generation, it also makes sense because it says that “their fathers” stiffened their necks. Therefore, there is a great possibility that the אֲבוֹתָם in 2Kgs 17:14 also points to the first Exodus generation. The tradition, which is about the fathers of the Israelites who did not believe in God, is quoted as an example to illustrate that the Israelites were very stubborn. But it is not certain which incident shows that their father did not believe in God. Again, the object of their disbelief is clear, but the content of their disbelief is not.

In Ps 78:21-22, the subject of אמן is “Jacob/Israel” (Ps 78:21): it represents the Exodus generation, since the context of Ps 78:22 is about the murmuring stories in the wilderness. The people demanded more food (Ps 78:18). They doubted whether God could give bread or provide meat for

“God was able to supply water for the people without their help, without striking the rock.”⁹⁰ Thus, we interpreted that this disbelief is that Moses did not believe the words of YHWH. He did not believe that he could tell a rock to yield water to the people. Therefore he did not do according to the command of YHWH. Rather than speaking to the rock, he struck it.

How is the disbelief related to the failing to regard YHWH as holy? We have seen that there are four ways to express the phrase “sanctifying God.” It can mean manifesting God’s *power*, *awefulness*, *otherness* and *glory*. Now we shall see that the dimension of “power” attracts more attention. According to Wong, Moses exalted himself higher than God, and made the people focus on his *power* instead of YHWH’s *power*. Moses did not rely on God in executing the instructions and did not manifest YHWH as the holy one, the *powerful* and wholly other God.⁹¹ It is possible that the Israelites did not realize that it was YHWH who had given them waters from the rock and turned away their affliction.⁹² Thus Moses and Aaron hindered the people from seeing that YHWH, as the God of the people, helps the people with wonders.⁹³ So they had not fulfilled their work that YHWH should be regarded as

them (Ps 78:20). This shows that the people did not believe that God could provide food for them. In this case, the content of their disbelief is obvious. The above examples show that the usage of the verb *אִסַּח* varies from case to case. In two cases, the content of their disbelief is clear but have different meanings: they did not believe that God would bring them into the Promised land (Num 14:11); and they did not believe that God would provide enough food (Ps 78:22). In Deut 1:32 and 2Kgs 17:14, the content of their disbelief is not obvious. Wildberger also points out that the theological usage of the Hiphil of *אִסַּח* is “in no way uniform” because this verb is “nevertheless at home in various traditions” and its usage undergoes “transformation in the course of the history of Israelites religion.” See H. Wildberger, *TLOT* 1:146.

⁹⁰ Jepsen, *TDOT* 1:304.

⁹¹ Ka Leung Wong, *Book of Numbers* (Hong Kong: Logos, 2008), 251-252. (Chinese)

⁹² Schmidt, *Numeri*, 93.

⁹³ Schmidt, *Numeri*, 93.

holy before the people.⁹⁴ It is also possible that the failure to sanctify appears to refer to Moses' ignoring the capacity of words alone, the speaking to the rock, to bring about a divinely directed result.⁹⁵

What is the relationship between sanctifying God and the punishment? It is believed that if Moses spoke to the rock, he could manifest the *power* of the word of God.⁹⁶ As Moses did not speak to the rock, he failed to demonstrate the holiness of YHWH to the Israelites.⁹⁷ Artus observes that the theme of holiness is developed by the preceding chapters of Num 20.⁹⁸ First, in Num 15:40 the chapter concludes with an exhortation to the holiness of the Israelites.⁹⁹ Second, in Num 16:1-17:5 (especially 16:5) the question of holiness is the core issue of the confrontation between Moses and his critics.¹⁰⁰ Third, in Num 18 the legislative texts are about the holiness of the sanctuary.¹⁰¹ Finally, in Num 20:12 Moses and Aaron failed to show YHWH's holiness, that is the *power* of His word and actions.¹⁰² Therefore, the literary context of Num 20 with its preceding texts can help to explain the importance of "sanctifying God." The Promised Land, according to Artus, is only for those who can demonstrate "a sufficient holiness" to live in the presence of the holy

⁹⁴ Schmidt, *Numeri*, 93.

⁹⁵ Calum Carmichael, *The Book of Numbers: A Critique of Genesis* (New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 2012), 123.

⁹⁶ Artus, *Etudes*, 237.

⁹⁷ Artus, *Etudes*, 237.

⁹⁸ Artus, *Etudes*, 237.

⁹⁹ Artus, *Etudes*, 237.

¹⁰⁰ Artus, *Etudes*, 237.

¹⁰¹ Artus, *Etudes*, 237.

¹⁰² Artus, *Etudes*, 237.

par excellence: YHWH.¹⁰³ Since Moses and Aaron did not regard God as holy, they were not allowed to enter the land.

But it has been pointed out that the punishment of Moses and Aaron is a denial of their future “leadership” rather than a denial of their “personal privilege” of entering the land.¹⁰⁴ The leadership of Moses and Aaron is shown by the Hiphil of the verb בוא (“bring”/ “lead”) in Num 20:12. Sakenfeld also observes that God’s judgment does not say that the two will not personally enter the land; rather the emphasis is on that they will not “lead” this assembly into the land.¹⁰⁵ A possibility is given by Seebass, who says that the leadership of bringing the Israelites into the land must be dependent on the promise of God, which is the word of God. The denial of God’s word will lead to the consequential loss of that leadership.¹⁰⁶ Thus the punishment on Moses and Aaron is mainly about the loss of leadership, not just the loss of the entry of the land.

Why was their leadership removed? It is implied that Moses disobeyed God deliberately just as the offender in Num 15:30-31 when Moses raised his hand. According to the sentence in Num 15:30-31, Moses should be “cut off” from his people. Many attempts have been made as to how the sentence of “cutting off” was executed.¹⁰⁷ The LXX translator of Num 15:30 understands that it was the premature death of the offender, so LXX translates נכרתה as ἐξολεθρευθήσεται (“he shall be

¹⁰³ Artus, *Etudes*, 238.

¹⁰⁴ Lee, “Conceptual Approach,” 223, 224-225.

¹⁰⁵ Sakenfeld, “Problems,” 149.

¹⁰⁶ Seebass, *Numeri 10,11-22,1*, 282.

¹⁰⁷ G. F. Hasel, “כרת,” *TDOT* 7:348.

completely destroyed”). The passage Num 15:32-36 shows clearly that the offender needed to face the death penalty because YHWH told Moses that the offender should be put to death by stoning (Num 15:35). However, the term “cutting off” is absent in Num 15:32-36.¹⁰⁸ Therefore, “cutting off” in Num 15:30-31 does not necessarily mean the death penalty in Num 15:32-36. In the majority of offenses, the penalty “cutting off” originally meant a cutting out which leads to “banishment from one’s clan or territory”¹⁰⁹ or “exclusion from the cultic community”¹¹⁰ or “excommunication from the cultic community and the covenant people.”¹¹¹ But in the course of time it was perceived somewhat differently. It came to connote premature death, loss of status or office, and finally “death at the hands of heaven.”¹¹² If Moses needed to be separated from the people, he could not lead them into the Promised Land.

3. The re-interpreting of the sin of Moses in Num 27

Num 27:12-14 is a command of YHWH to Moses when Moses and the people had settled in the plains of Moab (Num 22:1; 26:3, 63). This place is different from the location where the incident occurred in Num 20:1-13. Moses and the people were

¹⁰⁸ The expression “cutting off” can be found in Exod 31:14, which also talks about the profanation of the Sabbath.

¹⁰⁹ Levine, *Numbers 1-20*, 466.

¹¹⁰ Barnabas Lindars, “Ezekiel and Individual Responsibility,” *VT* 15 (1965): 460.

¹¹¹ Hasel, *TDOT* 7:348.

¹¹² Levine, *Numbers 1-20*, 466.

at Kadesh at that time. The saying in Num 27:12-14 consists of three parts: the order to ascend the mountain and see the land (Num 27:12); Moses' death is foretold (Num 27:13); and the reason for Moses' death (Num 27:14).

What is the meaning of “rebellious against God's word”? In Num 27:14, מרה (“to be rebellious”)¹¹³ is in the Qal stem. The verb מרה occurs three times in the book of Numbers (Num 20:10; 20:24; 27:14), eight times in the book of Deuteronomy and forty-four or forty-five times in the Hebrew Bible. In Num 20:10, the participle of מרה is used as a noun. Moses rebuked the Israelites as “rebels.” In Num 20:24 and 27:14, the object of the verb מרה is פי (“my [=YHWH's] mouth”), that is, the command or word of YHWH.

Both Rolf Knierim and Ludger Schwienhorst find out that this verb is used in the two oldest instances that the son rebelled against his parents (Deut 21:18, 20).¹¹⁴ Schwienhorst expresses that מרה is a word of “negative import” denoting willful, fundamental, and rebellious disobedience.¹¹⁵ When this verb is used with divine object, it refers “consistently to stubbornness toward God.”¹¹⁶ This verb is used in accusations against Israel's rebelliousness with respect to YHWH's “public deeds especially those in the wilderness.”¹¹⁷

Why is “not believing in God” replaced by “rebellious against God's word” in Num 27:14? In Chapter Four it has been discussed that the “rebellious” in Num 27:14

¹¹³ HALOT 1:633.

¹¹⁴ Rolf Knierim, “מרה,” TLOT 2:688; Ludger Schwienhorst, “מרה,” TDOT 9:7.

¹¹⁵ Schwienhorst, TDOT 9:7.

¹¹⁶ Knierim, TLOT 2:687.

¹¹⁷ Knierim, TLOT 2:688.

may be due to the combination of Num 20:12 with Num 20:24. According to Num 27:12-14, the mention of “Aaron’s being gathered to his people” is used to compare with “Moses’ being gathered to his people.” Since Num 20:24 depicts that Aaron was going to be gathered to his people, this verse is used in Num 27:12-14. When Num 27:12-14 adopts Aaron’s death, it also adopts the reason for his death: rebelling against YHWH’s word. Therefore, Num 20:24 is the first that re-interprets the sin of Moses and Aaron to be rebelling against YHWH’s word because they have not done what YHWH commanded them to do in the incident of waters from the rock. Then, why is “not believing in God” replaced by “rebelling against God’s command” in Num 20:24? There are different suggestions on the question of the replacement of **לֹא הֵאֱמַנְתֶּם בִּי** (“not believed in me”) by **מָרִיתֶם אֶת פִּי** (“rebelled against my word”) in Num 20:24 and 27:14.

The suggestion that the change is used to accuse Moses by using the same word from his mouth is not satisfactory. Some scholars observe that in Num 20: 10 Moses had accused the Israelites of being rebels, in Num 20:24 and 27:14 Moses himself becomes guilty of the same charge.¹¹⁸ It is possible, but such ironic effect can be much enhanced if the word **מָרָה** is used immediately in Num 20:12 rather than in Num 20:24.

There is also no evidence to support the view of Schwienhorst, who thinks that the word’s function is to transform the Deuteronomistic usage of “rebelling.” He

¹¹⁸ Dozeman, “Numbers,” 219; E. Carpenter and M. A. Grisanti, “מָרָה,” *NIDOTTE* 2:1100; Wong, *Numbers*, 250.

contends that in the Deuteronomistic History **מרה** (especially in the phrase “to rebel against the mouth of YHWH”) is used to show that Israel’s rebelliousness consists in not listening to the commandments of YHWH.¹¹⁹ This Deuteronomistic usage is a term for *the people’s* rebelliousness. Schwienhorst regards that the Priestly writings (Num 20:12, 24 and 27:14) has “turned against” this Deuteronomistic usage. He thinks that **מרה** has become a term for *the leaders’* rebelliousness.¹²⁰ However, Schwienhorst does not give any basis or motivation for the Priestly School to turn against the usage of Deuteronomist. He has not explained why the rebellion of the leaders became a message of the Priestly School.

The explanation that the change can re-interpret the meaning of “not believing in me” is more possible. The change of verb (from **לא האמנתם** to **מריתם**) is an interpretation that the rebellion of Moses and Aaron (**מריתם**, 20:24) has been replaced with the focus on their faithlessness (**לא האמנתם**, 20:12).¹²¹ In addition, the usage of the expression **פי** (“my [=YHWH] word”) as the direct object of “rebel” is used to contrast the main theme of “obeying YHWH’s word” in the book of Numbers. The expression **פי יהוה** is a characteristic expression in Numbers. There is a high occurrence of the prepositional phrase **על פי יהוה** (“according to the word of YHWH”) in the book of Numbers. Of the twenty-five occurrences of the prepositional phrase **על פי יהוה** in the Hebrew Bible, nineteen were found in

¹¹⁹ Schwienhorst, *TDOT* 9:9.

¹²⁰ Schwienhorst, *TDOT* 9:9.

¹²¹ Sailhamer, *Pentateuch*, 76.

Numbers.¹²² Ten of the nineteen refer to the leaders (“Moses and Aaron” or “Moses” or “Aaron”) carrying out an instruction according to the word of YHWH.¹²³ The remaining nine occurrences refer to the Israelites performing an action according to the word of YHWH. Therefore, the book of Numbers highlights that both the leaders and the people have carried out the instructions according to the word of YHWH. The expression **פִּי יְהוָה** signifies the obedience of the leaders and the people in Numbers. When the redactors use the expression “rebellious against **פִּי יְהוָה**” to re-interpret the sin of Moses and Aaron, they may want to imply that the rebellion of Moses and Aaron is a sin which contrasts with their usual obedience in the book of Numbers.¹²⁴

Furthermore, the meaning of “rebellious against YHWH’s word” is more concrete than “not believing in God.” Saying that “Moses and Aaron did not believe in God” does not specify what action means that they did not believe in God. When saying that “Moses and Aaron rebelled against YHWH’s word,” the action of their rebellion is obvious, they have not done the instructions according to YHWH’s word. In Num 20:24 the less clear expression “did not believe” is replaced by a clearer one,

¹²² Num 3:16, 39, 51; 4:37, 41, 45, 49; 9:18(2×), 20(2×), 23(3×); 10:13; 13:3; 33:2, 38; 36:5. Other occurrences: Exod 17:1; Lev 24:12; Deut 34:5; Josh 19:50; 22:9; 2 Kgs 24:3. There are two additional occurrences of the prepositional phrase **עַל פִּי** (“according to His word”) in the book of Numbers: Num 27:21(2×).

¹²³ Moses only: Num 3:16, 51; 13:3; 33:2; 36:5. Moses and Aaron: Num 3:39; 4:37, 41, 45, 49. Aaron only: Num 33:38.

¹²⁴ There are two occurrences where “YHWH’s word” is the object of the verb **מָרָה** (“to rebel”) (Num 20:24; 27:14); and three occurrences that “YHWH’s word” is the object of the verb **עָבַר** (“cross over/ disregard”) (Num 14:41; 22:18; 24:13). The theme of rebellion or disregarding of YHWH’s word is depicted in these five instances in the book of Numbers.

“rebelled against YHWH’s word.”¹²⁵ One of the possibilities of the origin for this re-interpretation is that there are cases that “not believing” is used in connection to “rebellious” in Deut 9:23¹²⁶ and Ps 78:8.¹²⁷ The redactors of Num 20:24 may either share the same tradition of Deut 9:23 and Ps 78:8, or be influenced by the traditions of Deut 9:23 and Ps 78:8, who see that “rebellious” and “not believing” are simultaneous behavior of the sinners.

Thus we may conclude that in Num 27:12-14 the sin of Moses is changed to “rebelled against the word of YHWH.” This change is due to the adoption of Num 20:24 which speaks about Aaron being gathered to his people, and also about their rebelling against YHWH’s word. Therefore, Num 20:24 is the first to reinterpret the sin of Moses and Aaron to be rebelling against YHWH’s word because they have not done what YHWH commanded them to do. Num 27:12-14 follows this reinterpretation.

4. Conclusion

The argument of this chapter is that several faults can be found in the actions and speech of Moses in the incident of the waters from the rock in Num 20:1-13. The

¹²⁵ The accusatory formula “to rebel against the mouth of YHWH” can be found in some texts. With מרה in the Qal stem: Num 27:14; 1 Kgs 13:21, 26 ; with מרה in the Hiphil stem: Deut 1:26, 43; 9:23, 24; Josh 1:18; 1 Sam 12:14, 15. A number of occurrences are used in connection with “the command” (Deut 1:26, 43; 9:23; 1 Sam 12:14, 15; Lam 1:18) or “word” (Josh 1:18; 1 Kgs 13:21, 26; Ps 105:28; 107:11) or “laws” (Ezek 5:6) of God.

¹²⁶ “When YHWH sent you from Kadesh-barnea, saying, ‘Ascend and possess the land which I have given to you,’ then you rebelled (מרה, Hiphil imperfect) against the command of YHWH your God. And you did not believe (אמן, Hiphil perfect) in him and did not listen to his voice.” (Deut 9:23)

¹²⁷ “And they are not like their fathers, a stubborn and rebellious (מרה, Qal participle) generation, (that) did not prepare its heart and its spirit did not believe (אמן, Niphal perfect) God.” (Ps 78:8)

sin of Moses is found in Num 20:10. The speaking itself is a sin or the rash words are faults. Moses' sin can also be found in Num 20:11. The lifting up of Moses' hand in Num 20:11 consists of both literary and symbolic meaning. Such symbolic meaning expresses that Moses deliberately disobeys YHWH's command. The raising of Moses' hand alludes to the "high hand" in Num 15:30-31, which speaks about a man who defiantly disobeys the word of YHWH being "cut off" from his people. He misused the staff, and rather than speaking to the rock, he struck it. Num 20:12 also hints that Moses doubted God's word. In Num 20:12 Moses is said to be failing to believe in God. We interpreted that this disbelief was that Moses did not believe the words of YHWH. He did not believe that he could tell a rock to yield water to the people. Therefore he did not do according to the command of YHWH. He had not done all the commands of YHWH. The omission of carrying out some of the commands of YHWH is also one of the sins of Moses. In addition, in Num 20:12 the removal of the leadership of Moses from his people is another way to execute the punishment of "cut off." Strictly speaking, it is talking about the loss of the leadership office of Moses, not about his personal exclusion from the Promised Land.

We have also discussed that there are nuances on the exclusion of Moses in Num 20:1-13 and Num 27:12-14. In Num 27:12-14 (and in Num 20:24) the sin of Moses is changed to "rebelled against the word of YHWH." This change is due to the adoption of Num 20:24 which speaks about Aaron being gathered to his people,

and also about their rebelling against YHWH's word. Num 20:24 is the first to interpret the sin of Moses as "rebelling against God's word" in such incident. When the redactors use the expression "rebelling against **פִּי יְהוָה**" to re-interpret the sin of Moses and Aaron, they want to signify that the rebellion of Moses and Aaron is a sin which contrasts with their usual obedience in the book of Numbers. Num 27:12-14 receives that re-interpretation of the fault of Moses and rewrites it together with the sin of failing to regard God as holy.

Chapter Seven. Moses' Failure to Sanctify God in Deut 32

We have found that in Num 20:12 the loss of leadership of Moses is emphasised. In addition, the ban from the Promised Land is implied in the foretelling of Moses' being gathered to his people in Num 27:12-14. Such foretelling that Moses would be gathered to his people is changed to two commands in the post-Priestly redaction in Deut 32:48-52. In this chapter, we will study the re-writing of the sins and punishment of Moses in Deut 32:48-52.

1. The reworking of the sins of Moses in Deut 32

What is the meaning of “breaking faith with God”? In Deut 32:51 the verb **מַעַל** (“to break faith”) is in the Qal stem. This verb occurs three times in the book of Numbers (Num 5:6, 12 and 27), once in the book of Deuteronomy (Deut 32:52) and a total of thirty-five times in the Hebrew Bible. This verb is only used in the exilic and post-exilic literature.¹ It is commonly agreed that **מַעַל** is a late word found in the book of Ezekiel, the Priestly writings and the books of Chronicles.² The breaking faith can act directly toward human beings or towards God.³ There are only two occurrences in which the verb **מַעַל** is followed by the human object (Num 5:12, 27).

¹ R. Knierim, “מַעַל,” *TLOT* 2:681.

² Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 384; H. Ringgren “מַעַל,” *TDOT* 8:461; J. Alberto Soggin, *Joshua: A Commentary*. (trans. R. A. Wilson; OTL; London: SCM Press, 1972), 215.

³ Ringgren, *TDOT* 8:461.

The basic meaning of this verb is seen in Num 5:12 in which “going astray” is explained as “being unfaithful.”⁴ **נעל** refers to the legally definable relationship of trust that exists between two persons.⁵

When this verb is used with divine object, it can be translated as “unfaithfulness toward God.”⁶ Gordon McConville thinks that **נעל** is a strong term denoting an act tantamount to apostasy.⁷ Jacob Milgrom notices that the common denominator in all the occurrences of **נעל** in the Hebrew Bible is that **נעל** constitutes a sin against God.⁸ The verb **נעל** means trespassing upon the divine realm either by poaching on His sancta or breaking His covenant oath; it is a lethal sin which can destroy both the offender and his community.⁹ The formula “to break faith with YHWH” can be found in a number of texts.¹⁰ Knierim says that the direct references to YHWH in the various genres indicate an advanced state of theological thought in which inherently inappropriate actions are further evaluated in specific reference to the relationship of trust with YHWH.¹¹

There are scholars such as August Dillmann and Carl Steuernagel who have quoted Num 5:6, 12; 31:16 and Lev 5:15 to explain the meaning of breaking faith in Deut 32:51.¹² However, these references are not suitable because they are speaking

⁴ Knierim, *TLOT* 2:681.

⁵ Knierim, *TLOT* 2:681.

⁶ Ringgren, *TDOT* 8:461.

⁷ McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 460.

⁸ Jacob Milgrom, *Cult and Conscience* (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 16-17.

⁹ Milgrom, *Cult*, 21.

¹⁰ Lev 5:21; 26:40; Num 5:6; Deut 32:51; 1 Chron 10:13; 2 Chron 12:2; 26:16; 28:19, 22; 30:7. See Knierim, *TLOT* 2:681.

¹¹ Knierim, *TLOT* 2:682.

¹² Dillmann, *Deuteronomium*, 413; Steuernagel, *Deuteronomium*, 122.

in very different contexts from Moses' case. For instance, Num 5:6 depicts when a man or woman commits any sin toward a fellow man, such sin is also breaking faith with YHWH. But this is not the situation of Moses since in Num 20:1-13 and Num 27:12-14 YHWH never said that Moses had committed sin towards the people. According to Num 5:12, the breaking faith is about any man's wife who has been unfaithful to her husband. Such breaking faith in a husband-wife relation cannot be applied on Moses' relation with YHWH. In regard to Num 31:16, the text of MT is **למסר מעל** ("to become the occasion for apostasy").¹³ It requires emendation to make it to **למעל מעל** ("to commit sin"). Besides, the breaking faith of the Israelites in this context is about their worship of the gods of the daughters of Moab with whom they indulged in sexual immorality in the incident of Peor.¹⁴ Thus it cannot be used to explain the nature of the sin of Moses and Aaron. Regarding Lev 5:15, the verb **מעל** is not used with the preposition **ב**, and the direct object is not YHWH. This usage is different from that of Deut 32:51. For these reasons, the meaning of breaking faith in Deut 32:51 must not correlate with Num 5:6, 12; 31:16 and Lev 5:15.

Why is "rebelling against God's command" replaced by "breaking faith with God"?

Problematic is the replacement of **פִּי מְרִיתֶם** ("you rebelled against my word")

¹³ HALOT 1: 608.

¹⁴ The incident is depicted in Num 25:1-3.

or **מעלתם בי** (“you broken faith with me”) by **לא האמנתם בי** (“you did not believe in me”). Why is the description of the sin of Moses and Aaron changed? One may think that “breaking faith” can harmonise or integrate the two different meanings of “not believing” and “rebellious.” However, in no case is “to break faith” used in parallel with “not to believe.” Nowhere can we find that “to break faith” is used in connection with “to rebel.” Therefore, “breaking faith” cannot represent an integration of both of the meanings of disbelief and rebellion.

Can the term “breaking faith” be used to explain the meaning of failing to regard YHWH as holy? Although Ringgren sees that the “breaking faith” in Deut 32:51 establishes a clear connection with the violation of what is sacred,¹⁵ he has not provided any argument for this interpretation. It seems that Ringgren supposes that the two causal clauses are in parallel and with similar meanings, so that the connection is established.

Parallel structure of Deut 32:51a and 51b

Deut 32:51a	על אשר	מעלתם בי	בתוך בני ישראל...
Deut 32:51b	על אשר	לא קדשתם אותי	בתוך בני ישראל

This may be possible if we assume that verse 51a and verse 51b are in semantic equivalence. These two clauses are written with the same structure which starts with **על אשר** (“because”) and ends with **בתוך בני ישראל** (“in the midst of the Israelites”). We may say that **מעלתם בי** (“you broke faith with me [= YHWH]”) is parallel with **לא קדשתם אותי** (“not sanctified me [=YHWH]”). However, verse 51b can be

¹⁵ Ringgren, *TDOT* 8:461.

synonymous with verse 51a, or it can extend the meaning of verse 51a. Hence, this parallel structure does not guarantee that breaking faith with God is equivalent to failing to sanctify God.

Martin Rose is not wrong in saying that the breaking faith of Moses and Aaron has affected the sacred sphere.¹⁶ They have not respected the holiness of God.¹⁷

This interpretation is possible if we apply Milgrom's study of **מעל**, which can mean trespassing upon God's sancta.¹⁸ However, Rose's reference of Biblical texts may not be suitable. He refers to Josh 7:1 and Ezek 18:24. None of these texts fits the case of Moses. According to Josh 7:1, the object of the verb **מעל** is **חרם**, not YHWH. So the usage is different from that of Deut 32:51 in which the direct object of the verb **מעל** is "me [=YHWH]." Regarding Ezek 18:24, the verb **מעל** is not used with the preposition **ב**, and the object is not YHWH.

The breaking faith may be used to explain the punishment of exclusion from the Promised Land. There are a number of occurrences where the verb **מעל** is connected to the exile. The unfaithfulness of the Israelites is regularly punished by military defeat and exile, including the final exile of both northern and southern kingdoms.¹⁹ The words for the exile are different. The verb **מעל** is used to describe the sin which caused the exile in Lev 26:40-41;²⁰ Ezek 17:20;²¹ 39:23;²² Neh 1:8;²³ Dan 9:7.²⁴

¹⁶ Martin Rose, *5. Mose Teilband 2: 5. Mose 1-11 und 26-34* (ZBAT 5; Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1994), 51.

¹⁷ Rose, *5. Mose Teilband 2*, 51.

¹⁸ Milgrom, *Cult*, 21.

¹⁹ H. G. M. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles* (NCBC; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1982), 94.

²⁰ "If they confess their iniquity and the iniquity of their forefathers, in their unfaithfulness which they broke faith [**מעל**, Qal perfect] against me, and also which they acted against me with hostility, I

Most of these texts are post-exilic. After the exile, the Israelites understood their sin as a kind of breaking faith against YHWH. The exclusion has a common point with the exile. The exile forced the people to leave the Promised Land, while the exclusion prevented the people from entering the Promised Land. In both cases, the Israelites lived outside the Promised Land. As such, the two incidents are connected. It may be right that the record of Moses' offense here serves to reinforce the connection between sinning against YHWH and taking possession of the land.²⁵ Then the reasons that led to the punishment (exile and exclusion) might also be connected. Consequently the reason for the *exile* ("to break faith" with YHWH) is also the reason for the *exclusion* ("to break faith" with YHWH). The late scribal school who redacted Deut 32:48-52 might be influenced by the theology that one of the reasons for the exclusion is due to "breaking faith" against God. The verbs "did not believe" in Num 20:12 and "rebelled" in Num 27:12 were then replaced by the verb "to break faith" in this interpretation of exile and exclusion.

Finally, the breaking faith may be used to explain the punishment of death. The

also was acting against them with hostility, to bring [בוא, Hiphil perfect] them into the land of their enemies..." (Lev 26:40-41)

²¹ "I will spread my net over him, and he will be caught in my snare. Then I will bring [בוא, Hiphil perfect] him to Babylon and judge him there for his unfaithfulness which he has broken faith [בעל, Qal perfect] against me." (Ezek 17:20)

²² "The nations will know that the house of Israel went into exile [גלה, Qal perfect] for their iniquity because they broke faith [בעל, Qal perfect] against me..." (Ezek 39:23)

²³ "Remember the word which You commanded Moses your servant, saying, 'If you break faith [בעל, Qal imperfect] I will scatter [פזץ, Hiphil imperfect] you among the peoples.'" (Neh 1:8)

²⁴ "...to the men of Judah, the inhabitants of Jerusalem and all Israel, those who are nearby and those who are far away in all the lands where you have driven [נדה, Hiphil perfect] them there, because of their unfaithfulness which they have broken faith [בעל, Qal perfect] against you." (Dan 9:7)

²⁵ R. E. Clements, "The Book of Deuteronomy," in *The New Interpreter's Bible*, vol. 2 (Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 1998), 529.

usage of the verb **מעל** in 1 Chr 10:13 is similar to that of Deut 32:51:

Object	Break faith			Die	Text
בִּיהוָה	מעל		שָׁאוּל בַּמַּעַלֹּי אֲשֶׁר	וַיָּמָת	1 Chr 10:13a
בִּי	מַעַלְתָּם	עַל אֲשֶׁר	...	וַיָּמָת	Deut 32:50-51a

1 Chr 10:13 So Saul died for his trespass which he broke faith against
YHWH...

Deut 32:50-51a Die... because you broke faith with Me...

The Chronicler explains that the death of Saul is due to his unfaithfulness to YHWH.

The verb **מעל** is used with the preposition **ב** and the object is YHWH. Besides, the expression follows the death of Saul. Such sentence structure is quite similar to that of Deut 32:51, in which an explanatory subordinate clause is used to explain why Moses has to die. This similarity certainly cannot be evidence for the interdependence between 1 Chr 10:13 and Deut 32:51, or for saying that Deut 32:51 alludes to 1 Chr 10:13. It is because Saul broke faith with God by not seeking guidance from YHWH, but by consulting a ghost. Such sin is different from that of Moses. However, it opens a possibility that the redactor of Deut 32:48-52 shares a similar idea of the Chronicler that *death* would be the penalty of breaking faith with YHWH. Therefore, the replacement is probably due to the fact that the sin of “breaking faith with YHWH” can explain why Moses has to die.

From the above discussion, we may conclude that the expression “breaking faith” can be used to parallel with the transgression against the sacred, and to

emphasis the punishment of such sin will lead to death penalty or deportation from the Promised Land.

2. The relational dimension of sanctifying God in Deut 32

In Deut 32:48-52 the sin of failing to sanctify God is clarified, and the death penalty as a punishment is also highlighted. It seems that in the time of the post-Priestly redaction of the Pentateuch, sanctifying God became an important issue that a failing of it would lead to the death penalty. Why is sanctifying God so important? This section will suggest that the “sanctifying God” in Deut 32:51 is not just interpreted in an abstract sense as God is holy *in himself*, but rather in a *relational* dimension. Such a relational dimension can give a clue to the importance of sanctifying God.

The texts show that the verb “to sanctify” is connected to “in the midst of the Israelites.” In Deut 32:51 we can find **בְּתוֹךְ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל** (“in the midst of the Israelites”). This phrase occurs seven times in Numbers (Num 1:49; 2:33; 9:7; 18:20, 24; 26:62; 35:34), twice in Deuteronomy (two times in Deut 32:51) and sixteen times in the Hebrew Bible. It is not a Deuteronomistic language. In the two occurrences of **בְּתוֹךְ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל** in Deut 32:51, one is used to modify the verb **מָעַל**, the other one is used to modify **קָדַשׁ** :

...	בְּתוֹךְ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	בִּי	מָעַלְתֶּם	עַל אֲשֶׁר	Deut 32:51a
	בְּתוֹךְ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	אוֹתִי	לֹא קָדַשְׁתֶּם	עַל אֲשֶׁר	Deut 32:51b

We cannot find any other occurrence of the phrase “in the midst of the Israelites” in

connection to the verb מעל except here. But we can find one occurrence of

בְּתוֹךְ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל that is connected to the verb קדש in Lev 22:32:

	"... the Israelites"		"Sanctify"		Text
	לְעֵינֵי בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל		לְהַקְדִּישֵׁנִי	...	Num 20:12
	לְעֵינֵיהֶם	בְּמִים	לְהַקְדִּישֵׁנִי	...	Num 27:14
	בְּתוֹךְ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל		לֹא קִדְשְׁתָּם אוֹתִי	...	Deut 32:51
	אֲנִי יְהוָה מְקַדְּשְׁכֶם	בְּתוֹךְ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	וְנִקְדַּשְׁתִּי	...	Lev 22:32

Parallel texts of the verb “to sanctify” are connected to “before the eyes of the Israelites” and “in the midst of the Israelites.” The change of the expression from להקדישני to לא קדשתם אותי is aimed at clarification of the meaning of the sentence. The change of the phrase from לעיני בני ישראל to בתוך בני ישראל is not aimed at any clarification. In addition, this change is not aimed at better connection to the book of Deuteronomy because this phrase is not used except here in Deut 32:48-52. Therefore, it is possible that the usage of בתוך בני ישראל “betrays” that this passage is influenced by Lev 22:32 in which we also find such a phrase.²⁶ When the verb “to sanctify” is used with the phrases “in the midst of the Israelites” in Deut 32:51, the importance of “sanctifying God” should be understood with its connection with the Israelites. God is not only holy *in himself*, but also holy *for the Israelites*. Holiness is understood from the viewpoint of God’s relationship to man.²⁷ What is the meaning

²⁶ Nihan indicates that there is a connection between Lev 22:31-33 and Num 20:12-13. See Christophe Nihan, “La mort de Moïse (Nb 20,1-13; 20,22-29; 27,12-23) et l’édition finale du livre des Nombres,” in *Les dernières rédactions du Pentateuque, de l’Hexateuque et de l’Ennéateuque* (ed. T. Römer et al.; BEThL 203; Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 145-182; especially 165.

²⁷ W.H. Schmidt, *The Faith of the Old Testament: A History* (trans. J. Sturdy; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983), 155. Horst Preuss also states that YHWH as a holy God is holy not for and by Himself, “meaning that He is exalted over and separated from the world and humanity; rather, He is “holy in your (= Israel’s) midst” (Hos 11:9), that is, He is the “Holy one of Israel.” See Horst Dietrich Preuss, *Old Testament Theology* (trans. Leo G. Perdue; OTL; 2 vols.; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster

of “sanctifying God” in Lev 22:31-33?

Sanctifying God in Lev 22:31-33

Lev 22:31-33 (MT)		English Translation
ושמרתם מצותי	31	And you shall keep My commandments,
ועשיתם אתם		and do them,
אני יהוה		I am YHWH. ²⁸
ולא תחללו את שם קדשי	32	And you shall not profane My holy name, ²⁹
ונקדשתי בתוך בני ישראל		but I shall be sanctified among the Israelites,
אני יהוה מקדשכם		I am YHWH who sanctifies you
המוציא אתכם מארץ מצרים	33	who brought you out from the land of Egypt,
להיות לכם לאלהים		to be your God,
אני יהוה		I am YHWH.

Lev 22:32 belongs to the unit Lev 22:31-33, which is a conclusion of both chapter 21-22 and chapter 17-22.³⁰ The section Lev 21-22 consists of five speeches to Moses,³¹ he is to convey the first four to Aaron and his sons, the last to the Israelites and the priests. The contents of the five speeches can be divided into six parts, each with a mini-conclusion:

- (i) Prohibitions to avoid desecration of the priests (Lev 21:1-9);
- (ii) Prohibitions to avoid desecration of the high priest (Lev 21:10-15);
- (iii) Prohibitions to avoid desecration of the sanctuary and the offerings by contact

John Knox Press, 1995), 1:240.

²⁸ In MT of Lev 22:31 ועשיתם אתם is followed by אני יהוה. However, LXX, 4QLev^{b60} and SP omit such self identification formula. See John William Wevers, *Notes on the Greek text of Leviticus* (SCS 44; Atlanta, Geo.: Scholars Press, 1997), 363. Milgrom thinks that the self-identification formula serves effectively as the opening of an inclusio in the exhortation (vv. 31-33) and should be retained. See Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1888.

²⁹ MT has שם קדשי (“my holy name”), while LXX reads τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ ἁγίου (“the name of the holy one”).

³⁰ Alfred Marx, *Lévitique 17-27* (CAT IIIb; Genève: Labor et Fides, 2011), 137.

³¹ Schwartz, “Leviticus,” 245.

with defective priests (Lev 21:16-24);

(iv) Prohibitions to avoid desecration of the sanctuary and sacred offerings by contact with impure priests (Lev 22:1-9);

(v) Prohibitions to avoid desecration of sacred offerings by consumption by ineligible persons (Lev 22:10-16);

(vi) On offerings deemed unacceptable due to physical defect or pagan origin and inappropriate time, and an exhortation as final conclusion (Lev 22:17-33).

In each section, there is a mini-conclusion with the formula **אני יהוה מקדש** (“I am YHWH your/ their/ his sanctifier”). Each mini-conclusion gives the reason for keeping the commandments to prohibit the desecration of priests, the high priest, the sanctuary and sacred offerings. Lev 22:31-33, as a conclusion of Lev 21-22, calls the Israelites to uphold the two roles of YHWH (sanctifier and deliverer), they should not desecrate God’s name by disregarding the commandments, instead they should sanctify Him by keeping and doing the commandments.³²

Lev 22:31-33 also concludes Lev 17-22 by using corresponding words. In Lev 17:2 the verb **צוה** (“command”) is used to introduce the first part of the holiness code. In Lev 22:31, the term **מצותי** (“my commandments”) responds to this verb **צוה** in Lev 17:2.³³ Nihan contends that Lev 22:17-33 is conceived to build an inclusion with Lev 17.³⁴ The phrase **אני יהוה מקדשכם** (“I am YHWH your sanctifier”) builds

³² Walter Kornfeld, *Leviticus* (NEB 6; Würzburg: Echter, 1983), 89.

³³ Marx, *Lévitique 17-27*, 137.

³⁴ Nihan, *Priestly Torah*, 492.

an inclusion with both Lev 21:8 and Lev 20:7-8, a central exhortation in Lev 19-20.³⁵

Besides, the reference to the exodus from Egypt in a reverse sequence concludes chapter 19 (Lev 19:36).³⁶

YHWH should be regarded as holy

Lev 22:31-33 can be seen as four commands to the Israelites and two qualifiers of YHWH. The first two commands of the exhortation are “keeping” and “doing” the commandments of YHWH. The third command is “not desecrating” God’s holy name. The fourth is an implied command that YHWH should be regarded as holy. After these four commands, two qualifiers of YHWH are given as the theological rationale for the commands. The first one is *מִקְדָּשׁ־כֶּם* (“your sanctifier” in Lev 22:32c). According to the context, “your” refers to “all the Israelites.” Since Lev 22:17-33 is addressed to the Israelites and the priests (v. 18) in the *second* person, the object of God’s sanctification is “all Israel.”³⁷ Bertholet points out that not only the priests but also the Israelites are addressed, because the content of v.33 does not directly apply to the priests.³⁸ YHWH is their “sanctifier.” This is the reason that He should be regarded as holy. The people should sanctify Him for He has sanctified them.

³⁵ Nihan, *Priestly Torah*, 494.

³⁶ Marx, *Lévitique 17-27*, 137. In Lev 19:36, the sequence is : first “the exodus,” then the commands of keeping and doing YHWH’s laws. In 22:31-33, this sequence is reversed.

³⁷ Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1889.

³⁸ Alfred Bertholet, *Leviticus* (KHCAT; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1901), 78.

The second qualifier **הַמּוֹצִיא אֶתְכֶם** (“your deliverer”³⁹ in Lev 22:33) refers to the delivering of the Israelites from Egypt. Although this reference back to the Exodus event occurs only sporadically in the book of Leviticus, every time it is mentioned it is emphatic.⁴⁰ Lev 22:33 has dual function: on the one hand, the reference to YHWH as the God of the exodus serves as a motivation for the exhortation to obey YHWH’s law.⁴¹ On the other hand, the statement of the purpose of the exodus reinterprets the central concept of the Priestly narrative by associating it with the issue of Israel’s sanctification.⁴² In the Priestly writing, the purpose of the exodus is the transformation of Israel into God’s people, while in H, this transformation is achieved by the observance of YHWH’s laws leading to sanctification of the people.⁴³ In Lev 22:31-33, “sanctifying God” is the opposite of “desecrating the holy name of God.” The ways to “regarding God as holy” are “keeping” and “doing” God’s commandments. The reasons for “sanctifying God” are that He is the sanctifier and the deliverer of Israelites.

3. YHWH as the sanctifier of the Israelites

In Lev 22:31-33 the motivation of “keeping God’s commandments,” “doing them,” and “not desecrating God’s holy name” is stated with particular emphasis by

³⁹ Milgrom argues that when H intends a perfect, it uses **אֲשֶׁר הוֹצֵאתִי** (e.g., Lev 19:36; 25:38, 42, 55; 26:13). In Lev 22:33, it is with **הַמּוֹצִיא**, a participial noun is intended. Therefore, it is better to render it as “deliverer.” See Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1889.

⁴⁰ Erhard Gerstenberger, *Leviticus: A Commentary*, (trans. Douglas W. Stott; OTL; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), 332.

⁴¹ Nihan, *Priestly Torah*, 496.

⁴² Nihan, *Priestly Torah*, 496.

⁴³ Nihan, *Priestly Torah*, 496.

means of the self-introduction formula coupled with the references to holiness: “I am YHWH your sanctifier.”⁴⁴ YHWH’s role as “sanctifier” is mentioned *seven times* in the book of Leviticus:

Object of sanctification	Self-identification formula					Text
The Israelites	מקדשכם	יהוה	אני		...	Lev 20:8
The Israelites ⁴⁵	מקדשכם	יהוה	אני	קדוש	כי	Lev 21:8
The Israelites	מקדשכם	יהוה	אני		...	Lev 22:32
The priests ⁴⁶	מקדשם	יהוה	אני		כי	Lev 21:23
The priests	מקדשם	יהוה	אני	...	כי	Lev 22:9
The priests	מקדשם	יהוה	אני		כי	Lev 22:16
The high priest	מקדשו	יהוה	אני		כי	Lev 21:15

The object of sanctification should be deduced from the context. In Lev 20:8; 21:8

⁴⁴ Dommershausen, “חלל,” *TDOT* 4: 412.

⁴⁵ In LXX, SP, and 11QPaleoLev of Lev 21:8, the suffix of the “sanctifier” is the *third* person plural instead of the *second* person plural as in MT. The *third* person plural refers to “the priests.” See Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1809. The MT, however, is a more difficult reading because the sudden appearance of the *second* person plural suffix in the context requires a shift of the audience of the address from “Aaron and the priests” to “the people of Israel.” By the principle that a more difficult reading should be retained, so it is also possible to keep the *second* person plural suffix of the “sanctifier” in Lev 21:8. Therefore, the object of sanctification can be “the Israelites.”

⁴⁶ Besides, Milgrom suggests that the objects of sanctification in Lev 21:23 may be the sanctums (the veil and the altar in v.23) because he thinks that God initially sanctified them by means of his glory and continues to sanctify them by his presence. Milgrom also constructs an “introverted structure” of the seven “sanctifier” phrases: the first and seventh occurrences are directed to Israel; the second, third, fifth, and sixth, to the priest; and the fourth, “probably to the sanctums,” forming thereby the following introverted structure:

- A Israel (20:8)
- B, C Priests (21:8 LXX, 15)
- X Sanctums (21:23)
- B', C' Priests (22:9, 16)
- A' Israel (22:32)

The two phrases AA' (20:8; 22:32) are the only ones without the particle כי. See Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1832, 1888-89. However, the view here is that Milgrom’s “introverted structure” is not necessary for the following two reasons: First, even though we accepted the LXX third person *plural* suffix of the “sanctifier” in Lev 21:8, B and C are not the same. Regarding C, the third person *singular* suffix of the “sanctifier” in Lev 21:15 refers to “the high priest,” which is different from “the priests” of B. Furthermore, there are a number of opinions that the third person plural suffix of the “sanctifier” in Lev 21:23 refers to “the priests.” Consequently, the “introverted structure” is not necessary.

and 22:32, the object is “the Israelites.” In Lev 21:23; 22:9 and 16, the object is “the priests.” When the “sanctifier” appears as **מִקְדָּשׁוֹ** in Lev 21:15 it points to a singular object, “the high priest.”

It can be noticed that in Lev 22:31-3; and Lev 20:8, the idea of **שָׁמַר** (“keeping”) the commandments of YHWH is connected to the phrase **אֲנִי יְהוָה מִקְדָּשְׁכֶם** “I am YHWH who sanctifies you.” The two texts bring out the reciprocal relationship of being sanctified actively and passively. The people of God are not automatically sanctified by doing nothing, instead they should keep the commandments of God. God provides, through his commandments, the means by which Israel can attain holiness.⁴⁷ Since YHWH sets His name in the midst of His people, they must conduct themselves in a way that will not defile it. For whenever they transgress any of God’s laws, they shame His name and tarnish His reputation.⁴⁸

According to Lev 22:31-33, God should be regarded as holy in the midst of the sons of Israel because YHWH is the sanctifier of the Israelites. The holiness of YHWH is the foundation of the holiness of the people. The role of a sanctifier is very important to the Israelites. God’s will is very clear: the Israelites should be holy for God Himself is holy. God not only shows the *way* to holiness for the Israelites to follow, but *He* also sanctifies the Israelites. Although the holiness of God is opposed to the profane, yet it also enters the profane world, penetrates it, and makes it holy.⁴⁹

⁴⁷ Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1889.

⁴⁸ John Hartley, *Leviticus* (WBC4; Dallas, Texas: Word Books, 1992), 362.

⁴⁹ W. Pannenberg, *Systematic Theology* (trans. G. W. Bromiley; 3 vols.; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1991), 1:400.

YHWH's holiness as something ultimately grounded in the moral character of YHWH, whose chief attributes of unfailing love, mercy and forgiveness mark him off as different from humankind, yet which are intended to transform humanity into what it is unable fully to achieve itself.⁵⁰

Before YHWH sanctifies the people of Israel, He is regarded as holy among them, and the people should keep and observe the law of YHWH. Thus, the holiness of YHWH is also the foundation for the people to keep the law. Gorman's point that the holiness of God is itself a construction of the community, may be correct.⁵¹ If divine holiness is manifested among his people, then his role as sanctifier will be understood and his people will be sanctified.

Baruch Schwartz's comparison is useful. He has compared the views of non-Priestly (E and D) and Priestly (H)⁵² traditions regarding the nature of Israel's relationship with God.⁵³ His comparison can be summarized in the following table.

Schwartz's comparison of concept of Holiness in Non-P and H

	Non-Priestly tradition (E and D)	Priestly tradition (H)
1	Israel's holiness is the very fact of its election.	Israel's holiness is an emanation of the divine nature which turns Israel into a sacred object.
2	Israel's holiness is "bequeathed to it from on high."	God's holiness "radiates" to Israel.
3	Israel's holiness is passed on "genetically."	Israel becomes holy "constantly."
4	Israel's holiness is "a	Israel's holiness is "a quality to be

⁵⁰ John Rogerson, "What is Holiness?" in *Holiness: Past and Present* (ed. S. C. Barton; London: T&T Clark, 2003), 21.

⁵¹ Frank H. Gorman, *Leviticus: Divine Presence and Community* (ITC; Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 1997), 126.

⁵² Schwartz understands H as a section of the Priestly tradition.

⁵³ Baruch J. Schwartz, "Israel's Holiness: The Torah Traditions," in *Purity and Holiness: The Heritage of Leviticus* (ed. M. J. H. M. Poorthuis and J. Schwartz; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 50-59.

	dispensation of grace.”	acquired.”
5	Israel’s holiness is an expression of “privileged status.”	Israel’s holiness is an expression of Israel’s “utter subservience.”
6	Holiness is the precondition, results in the necessity to uphold the commandments.	Compliance with the commandments is the precondition, results in holiness.
7	God can rescind His election of Israel if they “let Him down.”	God can depart from Israel, “making holiness no longer attainable.”

In E and D, the Israelites have been elected by His grace and elevated to an exalted status as God’s own “treasure.” They are sanctified, and thus they should obey God’s commandments.⁵⁴ In H, Israel has been singled out and separated from the peoples, which means that God removed Israel from slavery in Egypt in order to “transform” Israel into his slave. God will take the initiative to sanctify His people. God will “radiate” His holiness to the Israelites and they should obey God’s commandments *in order to* be holy.⁵⁵ Then the process of sanctification will be actualized.

Schwartz takes Lev 22:31-32 as an example to illustrate that the “performance” of commandments “enables God’s own holiness to be manifest,” while failure to “perform” them is a “profanation of His name.”⁵⁶ YHWH sanctifies the Israelites by His presence if they keep His laws, and this in turn is what “perpetuates His own holiness.”⁵⁷ The concept of “sanctifying God” in Lev 22:31-33 can be used to interpret “rebellious against God’s word” in Num 27:14 (and “not believing in God” in Num 20:12). In Num 27:14, the sin of “rebellious against God’s word” itself is “failing to sanctify God.” If Moses did not obey God’s command, he would not show the role of God is the sanctifier of the Israelites. Hence, God is not regarded as holy.

⁵⁴ Schwartz, “Israel’s Holiness,” 50-52, 58.

⁵⁵ Schwartz, “Israel’s Holiness,” 52-58.

⁵⁶ Schwartz, “Israel’s Holiness,” 57.

⁵⁷ Schwartz, “Israel’s Holiness,” 58.

This theology can also applied to Num 20:12 and Deut 32:51.

Sanctifying God and the exclusion

When the people obey YHWH's law and behave according to His will, YHWH will be regarded as holy.⁵⁸ YHWH is sanctified when Israel obeys his commandments.⁵⁹ The failure to obey His commandments desecrates the name of God.⁶⁰ The context of Lev 20-22 highlights the relationship between “desecrating the name of God” and “sanctifying God.”⁶¹ For whenever they transgress any of

⁵⁸ Nihan also believes that YHWH is sanctified among His people by the strict and literal obedience to the Torah. See Nihan, “La mort de Moïse,” 165-166; Nihan, *Priestly Torah*, 495.

⁵⁹ Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1888.

⁶⁰ Schwartz, “Leviticus,” 249.

⁶¹ Lev 22:32 opens with a command **וְלֹא תַחֲלִלּוּ** (“and not to desecrate”) the holy name of YHWH. See Marx, *Lévitique 17-27*, 137. According to the context, the actions of not observing YHWH's commandments and disobeying to His laws will desecrate YHWH's holy name. See Nihan, *Priestly Torah*, 494. As the following table shows, we can find that the verb **חָלַל** always appears in the context of **מִקְדָּשׁ**:

“I, YHWH is ... sanctifier”					“desecrate”		Text
מִקְדָּשְׁכֶּם	יְהוָה	אֲנִי	...	אֶת שֵׁם קִדְשִׁי	וְלֹא תַחֲלִלּוּ	...	Lev 20:3, 8
מִקְדָּשְׁכֶּם	יְהוָה	אֲנִי	...	שֵׁם אֱלֹהֵיהֶם	וְלֹא יַחֲלִלּוּ	...	Lev 21:6, 8
מִקְדָּשׁוֹ	יְהוָה	אֲנִי	...	זֶרְעוֹ	וְלֹא יַחֲלִלּוּ	...	Lev 21:15
מִקְדָּשְׁכֶּם	יְהוָה	אֲנִי	...	אֶת מִקְדָּשִׁי	וְלֹא יַחֲלִלּוּ	...	Lev 21:23
מִקְדָּשְׁכֶּם	יְהוָה	אֲנִי			יַחֲלִלְהוּ	...	Lev 22:9
מִקְדָּשְׁכֶּם	יְהוָה	אֲנִי	...	אֶת קִדְשִׁי	וְלֹא יַחֲלִלּוּ	...	Lev 22:15, 16
מִקְדָּשְׁכֶּם	יְהוָה	אֲנִי	...	אֶת שֵׁם קִדְשִׁי	וְלֹא תַחֲלִלּוּ	...	Lev 22:32

The verb **חָלַל** in the Piel means “to desecrate.” Almost 66% of all occurrences of “to desecrate” are found in Ezek (31×) and in H (16×). See F. Maass, “חָלַל,” *TLOT* 1:427-28. To “desecrate” (or “profane”) means to make something unholy. The object of the verb is always something holy. See Wenham, *Leviticus*, 259. In the above seven occurrences, the object being desecrated includes:

- (i) God's name (Lev 20:3; 21:6; 22:32);
- (ii) the high priest's offspring (Lev 21:15);
- (iii) the sanctuary (Lev 21:23);
- (iv) the holy offerings (Lev 22:9, 15).

In Lev 22:32a, the concern is “not desecrating God's name.” Wenham says that the desecration occurs “when his name is misused ... by doing something that God disapproves.” By carrying out these actions Israel desecrates God's name; that is, “they have given him a bad reputation among the Gentiles.” See Wenham, *Leviticus*, 259.

YHWH's law, they shame His name and tarnish His reputation.⁶² Since His reputation is intricately tied up with the Israelites, for YHWH has identified Himself as the God who delivered Israel from the land of Egypt.⁶³ In the waters of Meribah, Moses and Aaron did not carry out YHWH's commands properly, and YHWH said that they did not regard Him as holy. According to the relational dimension of sanctifying God in Deut 32:48-52 and the context of Lev 22:31-33, the most natural way of sanctifying God is obeying God's commands and words, but not necessarily about manifesting God's power, awefulness, otherness or glory.

Moses' sin of "failing to sanctify God" desecrates the name of God and affects the people at the same time. If the people do not regard YHWH as holy, they will not observe His commandments. On the contrary, if God is regarded as holy by his people, his people will be sanctified by God. The sin of "failing to sanctify God" gives harmful effect to the formation of the holiness of the people. In the time of the post-Priestly redaction of the Pentateuch, sanctifying God was very important because it signified that YHWH was the sanctifier of the Israelites. Any sin of failing to sanctify God would lead to death penalty. The exclusion of Moses is a natural consequence of his death outside the Promised Land.

4. Conclusion

This chapter argues that the punishment of the removal of the leadership of

⁶² Hartley, *Leviticus*, 362.

⁶³ Hartley, *Leviticus*, 362.

Moses in Num 20 is rewritten as a death penalty in Deut 32. According to the post-Priestly Pentateuch redaction of Deuteronomy in Deut 32, the sin of failing to sanctify God is clarified, and the command to die on the mountain is stressed. Such post-Priestly redaction brings out that Moses is ordered to die because of the sin of failing to regard God as holy. The exclusion of Moses is a natural consequence of his death outside the Promised Land. The importance of sanctifying YHWH can be understood by the relational dimension of sanctifying God, and His role as the sanctifier of the Israelites.

Chapter Eight. The Death of Moses in Deut 31 and Deut 34

We have seen that the exclusion of Moses from the Promised Land is related to divine anger and sanctifying God in the previous chapters. Deut 31:2 and 34:4-5 contain reference to the exclusion of Moses, but it seems that no reason has been given. The purpose of the present chapter is to provide a discussion on the exclusion of Moses in Deut 31:2 and 34:4-5.

There are differences between Deut 31:2 and Deut 34:4-5. Firstly, they are in a different context. According to the time frame of Deut 31-34, Deut 31:2 is earlier than Deut 34:4-5. The saying of Moses in Deut 31:1-6 occurs after the covenant is renewed in Moab (Deut 29-30). Deut 34 occurs after the command of YHWH to Moses that he has to ascend the mountain of the Abarim (Deut 32:48-52), and the final blessing of Moses (Deut 33). Secondly, in Deut 31:2, Moses quotes the words of YHWH to himself, while in Deut 34:4 the *narrator* of Deuteronomy records the words of YHWH to Moses. Thirdly, there are different direct objects of the verb עבר (“cross”). In Deut 31:2, the direct object of the verb עבר is את הירדן הזה (“this Jordan”); while in Deut 34:4, the verb עבר does not have a direct object, rather there is an indication of the direction, שמה (“there”). According to the context of Deut 34:4, the word שמה (“there”) refers to הארץ (“the land”). Fourthly, according to our investigation of the chronological order of Deut 31:2 and Deut 34:4-5 in Chapter

Two, they belong to different layers of Deuteronomy. Deut 34:4-5 are later than Deut 31:2. Since the content and language of Deut 31:2 and 34:4-5 are quite different, in the following two sections, Deut 31:2 and 34:4-5 will be discussed separately.

1. The Exclusion of Moses in the Context of Deut 31:1-6

Deut 31:1-6 is a saying of Moses to the Israelites. He tells them that he could not be their military leader.¹ The conquest of the Promised Land will be led by YHWH and Joshua. Moses encourages the people to be strong and to pay attention to the works of YHWH. In Deut 31:2, Moses announces his age, and then he quotes YHWH's saying that he is not allowed to cross over the Jordan. It has been suggested that Moses is too old to lead the people to fight in a battle. Does the phrase "one hundred and twenty years" mean that Moses is very old at that time? Is there another way to understand the implication of Moses' age?

In the saying of Moses, Deut 31:3-6 itself is a unit framed by an *inclusio*:

כי יהוה אלהיך הוא ההלך עמך (Deut 31:3a) and יהוה אלהיך הוא עבר לפניך

(Deut 31:6b). This unit consists of eighteen verbs, ten of them are with YHWH as

their subject.² YHWH's past actions³ on the kings of Amorites would be repeated

¹ Commentators explain לִצְאת וּלְבוֹא ("to go out and to come in") in different ways: "to engage in active undertakings," "to exercise leading in war," "to lead" and "exercise military leadership." See Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 334; Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 372; Blenkinsopp, "Deuteronomy," 107; Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 289. Rose states that this expression is very common in the military field. Rose, "Empoigner," 137. This study understands that לִצְאת וּלְבוֹא means to lead the people to fight in a battle.

² The remains are: 2 imperatives to the Israelites ("be strong," "be courageous," 31:6) ; 2 jussives to the Israelites ("do not fear," "do not be tremble" 31:6); 2 waw consecutive perfects to the Israelites ("you will possess," 31:3; "you will do" 31:5); 1 participle modifying Joshua ("cross over" 31:3), and 1 verb with first person subject ("I [Moses] have commanded" 31:5).

on the nations before the Israelites. YHWH will deliver⁴ the nations to the Israelites. He has also spoken⁵ that Joshua will cross before the people. YHWH Himself will cross over⁶ and go⁷ with the Israelites. Furthermore, YHWH will not fail⁸ and forsake⁹ the Israelites. Thus, the divine actions are the grounds for the Israelites to be strong and courageous.

If the main focus of Deut 31:3-6 is YHWH's actions, can we read Deut 31:2 as it is also related to divine actions? Is verse 2 in tune with the emphasis of divine actions? The answer will be positive when we read וַיְהוָה אָמַר אֵלַי ("and YHWH has said to me" Deut 31:2d) as a divine action. This phrase refers directly to the dialogue between YHWH and Moses reported in Deut 3:23-28,¹⁰ it is a quotation of YHWH's saying in Deut 3:27.¹¹ The divine action in Deut 31:2d sets the spatial limit of Moses. Moses will not fight before the Israelites because the divine action has set a boundary that he cannot cross over. The end of Moses' leadership is a

³ שָׁמַר [Deut 31:3, 4] and עָשָׂה [Deut 31:4]

⁴ נָתַן [Deut 31:5]

⁵ דִּבֶּר [Deut 31:3]

⁶ עָבַר [Deut 31:3]

⁷ הֵלֵךְ [Deut 31:6]

⁸ רָפָה [Deut 31:6]

⁹ עָזַב [Deut 31:6]

¹⁰ Rose, "Empoigner," 137.

¹¹ It is obvious that Deut 31:2 is in parallel with Deut 3:26-27:

Deut 3:26-27	Deut 31:2
וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֵלַי	וַיְהוָה אָמַר אֵלַי
...	...
לֹא תַעֲבֹר	לֹא תַעֲבֹר
אֶת הַיַּרְדֵּן הַזֶּה	אֶת הַיַּרְדֵּן הַזֶּה

Deut 3:26-27	Deut 31:2
and YHWH said to me...	and YHWH said to me...
You will not cross this Jordan.	You will not cross this Jordan.

matter of divine veto.¹²

However, Deut 31:2 contains not only this explicit quotation, it also has one implicit allusion. The phrase **מאה ועשרים שנה** (“one hundred and twenty years” Deut 31:2b) is an allusion to the divine saying in Gen 6:3,¹³ where YHWH said that the days of the men would be **מאה ועשרים שנה** (“one hundred and twenty years”). Gen 6:3 begins with **וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה** (“And YHWH said”). The speaking of YHWH in Gen 6:3 can also be seen as a divine action. Deut 31:2b can point to the *content* of the saying of YHWH as well as this speaking *action* in Gen 6:3. In Deut 31:2, Moses tells the Israelites that he cannot be their military leader because his life-span will be finished according to the time limit set by YHWH in Gen 6:3. Hence, it seems likely that the age of Moses does not only point to the fact that Moses is very old, but also points to the divine saying action in Gen 6:3. YHWH has a statement which limits Moses’ life-span.

This implicit allusion is followed by the explicit quotation of YHWH’s saying in Deut 3:27, where YHWH does not allow Moses to cross over the Jordan. In Gen 6:3, **וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה**, the divine saying action sets the limit on human life-span; while in Deut 31:2d, **וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה**, the divine saying action also sets the limit of the space where Moses can live. Consequently, YHWH’s word has set the boundary on the life-span of Moses, and also the boundary on the location of Moses. There is a limit

¹² Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 358.

¹³ Levinson, “Deuteronomy,” 416. Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 358. Deut 31, because of its complex composition, is later than Gen 6:3.

in both the space and time of Moses. The exclusion of Moses in Deut 31:2 can be seen as a result according to the two speaking actions of YHWH who sets the time limit and spatial limit of Moses.

2. The Exclusion of Moses in Deut 34

In the saying of YHWH in Deut 34:4, He told Moses that he was not allowed to cross over to the Promised Land. The land which YHWH let Moses see is qualified by the clause, “which I swore to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, saying, ‘I will give it to your descendants.’” In Exod 33:1, the land is also qualified by the exact wordings:

אתננה	לזרעך	לאמר	לאברהם ליצחק וליעקב	אשר נשבעתי	הארץ	...	Deut 34:4
אתננה	לזרעך	לאמר	לאברהם ליצחק וליעקב	אשר נשבעתי	הארץ	...	Exod 33:1

In the Pentateuch,¹⁴ there are eight occurrences in which the Promised Land is qualified by the swearing to the three patriarchs (Gen 50:24; Exod 6:8; 33:1; Num 32:11; Deut 1:8; 6:10; 30:20; 34:4). But the patterns of these texts are slightly different from each other.¹⁵

¹⁴ Schmid has observed that the land promise as an oath to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob can no longer be found in Joshua-2 Kings. See Schmid, “The Late Persian,” 242.

¹⁵

				לאברהם ליצחק וליעקב			אשר נשבע	הארץ	Gen 50:24
אחה לכם	ונחתי			לאברהם ליצחק וליעקב	אח ידי	לתת אחה	אשר נשאתי	הארץ	Exod 6:8
	אתננה	לזרעך	לאמר	לאברהם ליצחק וליעקב			אשר נשבעתי	הארץ	Exod 33:1
				לאברהם ליצחק וליעקב			אשר נשבעתי	הארמה	Num 32:11
... ולזרעם.	לתת להם			לאברהם ליצחק וליעקב	לאבתיכם	יהוה	אשר נשבע	הארץ	Deut 1:8

The qualification of the land in Exod 33:1 is the only text that is the same as that Deut 34:4. In other Deuteronomic texts, the infinitive **לָחַת** is used, while in Exod 33:1 and Deut 34:4, the imperfect **אֶתְנַנֶּה** is used. Besides, in the Deuteronomic texts, the word “fathers” is placed before the three patriarchs, but the word “fathers” is absent in Exod 33:1 and Deut 34:4.¹⁶

However, the commands in Exod 33:1 have been changed in Deut 34:4. In Exod 33:1, Moses is commanded to **לֵךְ** (“go”, Qal) and **עֲלֶה** (“ascend”, Qal)¹⁷ the Promised Land. The commands “go” and “ascend” to Moses generate a new beginning of the journey to Moses and the Israelites after the incidents of the golden calf and the destruction of the tablets. The destination of the new journey would be the land which YHWH has promised to give to the descendants of the patriarchs. It implies that the Israelites, who had sinned in the golden calf incident, still have a chance to receive the land. In Exod 33:1, Moses is commanded to go and to ascend the Promised Land, but in Deut 34:4, Moses is not allowed to cross over the Promised Land. Why?

In Deut 34:4 no reason is given for Moses’ exclusion. Deut 34 does not want to

	לָחַת לָךְ			לְאִבְרָהִם לִיצְחָק וְלִיעֲקֹב	לְאִבְחִיךְ		אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּע	הָאָרֶץ	Deut 6:10
	לָחַת לָהֶם			לְאִבְרָהִם לִיצְחָק וְלִיעֲקֹב	לְאִבְחִיךְ	יְהוָה	אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּע	הָאֲדָמָה	Deut 30:20
	אֶתְנַנֶּה	לְזֶרַעְךָ	לֵאמֹר	לְאִבְרָהִם לִיצְחָק וְלִיעֲקֹב			אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי	הָאָרֶץ	Deut 34:4

¹⁶ Suzanne Boorer, *The Promise of the Land as Oath: A Key to the Formation of the Pentateuch* (BZAW 205; Berlin/ New York: de Gruyter, 1992), 122.

¹⁷ Propp explains, “In the Torah’s topography, Egypt is the lowest place on Earth, Canaan the highest. One always ‘descends’ to Egypt and ‘goes up’ to Canaan.” Cf. William Propp, *Exodus 19-40* (AB2a; New York: Doubleday, 2006), 597.

side either with the Deuteronomistic explanation of Moses' exclusion (in Deut 1:37; 3:26-27; 4:21) or with the post-Priestly explanation (in Num 20:12; 27:12-14; Deut 32:48-52). It knows both post-Priestly and Deuteronomistic traditions,¹⁸ but it does not agree with the Deuteronomistic and the post-Priestly positions. It mentions none of these explanations for Moses' death.¹⁹ Instead, Deut 34:7 offers its own interpretation: Moses is not allowed to enter the Promised Land, because his life-span of 120 years has just now run out.²⁰ Deut 34:7, like Deut 31:2, is motivated by the life-span of 120 years mentioned in Gen 6:3,²¹ according to which YHWH has established it for human life.²² At his age of 120, Moses is still full of "vigour and strength."²³ So, Moses has to die not because of his weakness or sickness. The only reason for Moses' death is that Moses has reached the age limit.²⁴ Since the

¹⁸ Similar conclusion in Thomas C. Römer and Marc Z. Brettler, "Deuteronomy 34 and the Case for a Persian Hexateuch," *JBL* 119 (2000): 408.

¹⁹ Schmid, "The Late Persian," 249.

²⁰ Schmid, "The Late Persian," 248.

²¹ Schmid, "The Late Persian," 248.

²² Edelman, *Open the Books*, 173.

²³ In Deut 34:7, Moses condition is described by two phrases: **לֹא כָהָתָה עֵינָיו וְלֹא נָס לָחָה**. The first phrase **לֹא כָהָתָה עֵינָיו** is usually interpreted as "Moses eye was not dimmed." The traditional interpretation of the second phrase **וְלֹא נָס לָחָה** is that "the natural moisture and freshness of his body was not reduced," (Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 424.) or "he was still full of vigor." (Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 395.) Tigay offers another interpretation, and he argues that the verb **נָס** means "dried up" and its subject **לָחָה** means "moisture," it "refers to lubricity in the sense of freshness and smoothness of the skin." There is no evidence that **לָחָה** means "vigor." He suggests that the second phrase **וְלֹא נָס לָחָה** means "the moistness of Moses' skin had not dried up." See Jeffrey H. Tigay, "וְלֹא נָס לָחָה 'He Had Not Become Wrinkled' (Deuteronomy 34:7)," in *Solving Riddles and Untying Knots: Biblical, Epigraphic, and Semitic Studies in Honor of Jonas C. Greenfield* (ed. Ziony Zevit et al.; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1995), 345-50. Jeremy Schipper adopts Tigay's interpretation and he uses this direction of interpretation in the exegesis of the first phrase **לֹא כָהָתָה עֵינָיו**. He observes that both the subject **עֵינָיו** and the verb **כָהָתָה** are in the singular form. If **עֵינָיו** refers to the eyes of Moses, it will be in the plural form as it is used in other texts, for example: Gen 27:1; 48:10; 1Sam 3:2; 1Sam 4:15; 1Kgs 14:4. By comparing the usage of the word **עֵין** in the Priestly text, he argues that in Deut 34:7, **עֵינָיו** "probably refers to Moses' skin rather than his eyesight." Consequently, the meaning of this phrase is that Moses' skin "had retained its shining appearance." See Jeremy Schipper, "The Meaning of **עֵין** in Deuteronomy 34:7," *ZAW* 126 (2014): 419-420.

²⁴ Edelman, *Open the Books*, 173.

human life-span was fixed by word of YHWH, Moses will die when his age reaches the end of the life-span. Despite Moses' exceptional status, in the end, like all humans, he has to submit to this limit.²⁵ In Schmid's wording, Moses' death is caused by *fate*,²⁶ not by divine anger or divine holiness.²⁷

The Meaning of על פי יהוה in Deut 34:5

According to Deut 34:5, Moses died in the Land of Moab על פי יהוה. What is the meaning of על פי יהוה? This idiom על פי is used frequently with reference to YHWH.²⁸ The phrase literally means "according to the mouth of YHWH."²⁹ It was interpreted midrashically to mean that Moses died by the "kiss" of God.³⁰ However, this way of interpretation does not agree with the typical usage of the expression in the Pentateuch. Of the twenty-two occurrences of the prepositional phrase על פי יהוה in the Pentateuch, one is found in the book of Deuteronomy, and the others are found in Exodus-Numbers.³¹ At these occurrences, the phrase is never interpreted literally, rather, it means "according to the word or command of

²⁵ Edelman, *Open the Books*, 173.

²⁶ Schmid, "The Late Persian," 248.

²⁷ For another point of view on the death of Moses without any explanation, see Olson, *Death of Moses*, 167. Olson thinks that the straightforward narration of Moses' death without explanation simply underscores the inevitable reality of human death and limitation. The text allows the mystery of human suffering and death to remain unanswered.

²⁸ Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 945.

²⁹ Cairns, *Deuteronomy*, 305; Christensen, *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12*, 871; Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 413; Smith, *Deuteronomy*, 380; Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 338.

³⁰ Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 423; Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 338.

³¹ Exod 17:1; Lev 24:12; Num 3:16, 39, 51; 4:37, 41, 45, 49; 9:18(2×), 20(2×), 23(3×); 10:13; 13:3; 33:2, 38; 36:5; Deut 34:5. There are two additional occurrences of the prepositional phrase על פי ("according to His word") in the book of Numbers: Num 27:21(2×).

YHWH.”³² Therefore, the more plausible translation of **עַל פִּי יְהוָה** in Deut 34:5 is “according to the word of YHWH.”

What is the syntactic function of **עַל פִּי יְהוָה**? Is the expression used to modify **וַיָּמָת** (“And he died”) or **בְּאֶרֶץ מוֹאָב** (“in the land of Moab”)? Nelson says that it is unclear whether it refers to the fact of Moses’ death or to its location outside the land.³³ Lundbom states that YHWH did not command Moses’ death; rather YHWH commanded that Moses would die outside the Promised Land, which is here fulfilled.³⁴ Lundbom’s statement, however, contradicts the factual evidence from Deut 32:50 where we find that YHWH did command Moses to die because the word **מָת** (“die”) is an imperative.

The syntactic function of **עַל פִּי יְהוָה** may not be a choice of “either or.” According to Deut 32:49-50, YHWH has commanded Moses to go up to the mountain which is located in the land of Moab, and die there. Consequently, **עַל פִּי יְהוָה** can be used to modify both the action **וַיָּמָת** and the location **בְּאֶרֶץ מוֹאָב**. But the expression may also refer to YHWH’s fulfillment of His own earlier prediction of Moses’ death in Deut 31:14,³⁵ where YHWH tells Moses that his time to die is near.

Then, what is the theological function of **עַל פִּי יְהוָה**? We have seen that there is a high occurrence of the prepositional phrase **עַל פִּי יְהוָה** in the book of Numbers.

³² Christensen, *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12*, 871; Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 423; Levinson, “Deuteronomy,” 427; Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 945; Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 413.

³³ Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 396.

³⁴ Lundbom, *Deuteronomy*, 945.

³⁵ Block, *Deuteronomy*, 808.

We have also seen that Numbers highlights that both the leaders and the people have carried out the instructions according to the word of YHWH. The expression **על פי יהוה** signifies the obedience of the leaders and the people to God. We have suggested that when the redactors of Numbers use the expression “rebellious against **על פי יהוה**” to re-interpret the sin of Moses and Aaron, they may want to imply that the rebellion of Moses and Aaron is a sin which contrasts with their usual obedience in the book of Numbers.³⁶

Then, in Deut 32:50, YHWH commands Moses to die on the mountain. It seems that “a second chance” is given to Moses. Would Moses obey YHWH in this time? According to Deut 34:5, Moses died **על פי יהוה**. This time Moses continues his obedience to YHWH. Even in his death, Moses proves a faithful servant.³⁷ He died not because his physical power has left him, but because of the will of YHWH.³⁸

Römer suggests that Deut 34 seems to be a more “Diaspora-oriented” text.³⁹ There is a non-fulfillment in Deut 34. Moses is allowed to see the Promised Land but he cannot enter there. Moses dies outside the Promised Land. One can understand Deut 34 as constructing Moses as a figure of identification for people living in the Diaspora. The important thing is not to live in the Promised Land, but to live and to

³⁶ There are two occurrences where “YHWH’s word” is the object of the verb **מרה** (“to rebel”) (Num 20:24; 27:14); and three occurrences that “YHWH’s word” is the object of the verb **עבר** (“cross over/disregard”) (Num 14:41; 22:18; 24:13). The theme of rebellion or disregarding of YHWH’s word is depicted in these five instances in the book of Numbers.

³⁷ Block, *Deuteronomy*, 808.

³⁸ Rüdiger Lux, “Der Tod des Mose als »besprochene und erzählte Welt«,” *ZThK* 84 (1987), 423.

³⁹ Thomas Römer, “The Date, Composition and Function of Joshua 24 in Recent Research,” *HeBAI* (2017): 211.

die according to the will of YHWH.⁴⁰ Since the destruction of Israel and Judah was due to the failure to obey YHWH's word.⁴¹ The people living in the Diaspora should remember that failure. Moses' example can encourage the people to live and to die with the obedience to the word of YHWH.

3. Conclusion

The results of this chapter may be summarized as follows. Deut 31:1-6 focus on divine action. The divine action of YHWH in Gen 6:3 sets the limit on human life-span; while that in Deut 31:2d sets the limit of the space where Moses can live. There is a limit in both the space and time of Moses. The exclusion of Moses in Deut 31:2 can be seen as a result according to the two speaking actions of YHWH who sets the time limit and spatial limit of Moses. This perspective continues in Deut 34 which knows both post-Priestly and Deuteronomistic traditions, but it does not agree with them. Instead, Deut 34:7 offers its own interpretation: Moses is not allowed to enter the Promised Land, because his life-span of 120 years has just now run out. Moses' death is caused by divine veto, not by divine anger or divine holiness. Although he has "rebelled against **פִּי יְהוָה**" in the incident of waters from the rock, Deut 34:5 shows that Moses can continue his obedience to YHWH for he died **עַל פִּי יְהוָה**. Moses died because of the will of YHWH. Deut 34 seems to construct Moses as a figure of identification for the Jews living in the Diaspora. The important

⁴⁰ Römer, "Joshua 24," 211.

⁴¹ Steven L. McKenzie, "Kings (Books)," in *EBR* 15: 306.

thing is not to live in the Promised Land, but to live and to die according to the will of YHWH.

Chapter Nine. Conclusion

This dissertation has investigated the exclusion of Moses from the Promised Land in Numbers and Deuteronomy. It started with the observation of the tensions of the different versions of the exclusion of Moses. The connections between the exclusion of Moses, divine anger and sanctifying YHWH were overlooked by previous scholars. Since we have found that different redactional layers of Deuteronomy correlate with the themes of divine anger and sanctifying God, and Deuteronomy can be understood in different perspectives, the research went along these four angles to get the four different answers. The related passages in the book of Numbers were also discussed.

According to Deut 1-3*, one of the oldest layer in the Deuteronomistic History, divine anger was directed at Moses because he was the leader of the first exodus generation on whom the wrath of God was visited. Moses was excluded because he should bear the same punishment as the first generation of Israelites who left Egypt. In regard to Deut 1:37-38, we first argued that they were original, and not secondary additions. A comparison of the two versions of the spy narrative in Deut 1:19-46 and Num 13-14 showed that the relationship between them was very complicated. There was two-way inter-dependence between the Numeri version and the Deuteronomic version. Num 13-14 was formed by integration of Deut 1:19-46 and an older

tradition which might also have been used by Deut 1. Certain parts were further redacted by later redactors.

Since the meaning of divine anger in a particular passage should be first understood in its own context, we concluded that Moses was not sinful in the context of Deut 1:19-46. There was no allusion to the incident of the waters of Meribah when he said that YHWH was angry with him because of the people. Moses was innocent, but he did not suffer vicariously. Being a leader, he suffered with the people. In that passage, we have seen a coexistence of “individual responsibility” and “corporate responsibility,” this suggested that it was difficult to apply only one principle to the reality.

In Deut 3:23-28, YHWH was angry with Moses because Moses irritated YHWH with his prayer, and also because of the Israelites. However, Moses was not punished after this divine anger. He was not permitted to pray that request again. The exclusion of Moses was not directly related to divine anger in Deut 3:26. The term “for your sake” was used to clarify that Moses did not sin. Since an accurate description of the theme of divine wrath should include a precise study on the words used for the anger of God, we have also carried out a word study on different expressions of divine anger in Deuteronomy, and the uniqueness of the words for divine anger has been pointed out. Twenty-one out of the twenty-seven occurrences of the wrath of God in Deuteronomy were due to human sin. The punishments triggered by divine anger were classified into three main principles: destruction,

measure for measure, and removal of gift. These results highlighted the peculiarities of the exclusion of Moses with whom God was angry not because of his sin. In addition, the punishment on Moses was measured according to the sin of the Israelites, not Moses himself.

Another reason was given in Deut 4 and the Deuteronomistic History. Deut 1-3 and Deut 4 were products of different periods because of their different stressed themes. Deut 1-3* belonged to one of the oldest layers of the Deuteronomistic History, while Deut 4 was a mixture of late layers of that History. Accordingly, Moses' exclusion was compared to the destruction and scattering of the future generations of the Israelites who provoked God to anger. There were "anger-punishment patterns" in Deut 4 and the Deuteronomistic History. We could find a varied "anger-punishment pattern" of the exclusion of Moses when it was compared with that patterns of the Deuteronomistic work. The "anger-exclusion pattern" of Moses in Deut 4 was used to confess the sin of the Israelites.

The other reason was given in Deut 32:48-52, which was not written by the same hand as Deut 1-3 because of the accumulative stylistic, factual, and theological considerations. We have discussed its Priestly nature with that of Num 20:1-13 and Num 27:12-14. Based on the persuasive arguments of Perlitt and Nihan, the solution to that problem adopted in this study was that Num 20:1-13; Num 27:12-14 and Deut 32:48-52 were probably post-Priestly, but their theologies might be still influenced by the theologies of the Priestly School and Holiness School. There were also

observations of the mixture of Priestly and non-Priestly language in the three passages. It was possible that the later scribal school has inherited the theologies of the Priestly School and the Deuteronomistic School during the last stage(s) of the formation of the Pentateuch.

In regard to the chronological order of the three passages of the exclusion of Moses in the post-Priestly redaction, it was: Num 20:1-13; then Num 27:12-14; and the last Deut 32:48-52. We proposed that Num 27:12-14 was later than Num 20:1-13 because the former presupposes the content of Num 20:1-13, and it had integrated the key expressions in Num 20:12 and Num 20:24. Deut 32:48-52 was said to be later than Num 27:12-14 because of the evidence of stylistic improvements and meaning clarifications in Deut 32:48-52. Rephrasing Num 27:12-14 by using two explanatory subordination clauses, it changed the infinitive construction to a clause with the verb “to sanctify” in Piel perfect with explicit negation. The meaning of the sins of Moses was then clarified and emphasised in these modifications.

Since Deut 31:1-6, a passage connected to Deut 1-3, was one of the layers in the Deuteronomistic History, it was earlier than Deut 34:4-5* which belonged to the Pentateuch redaction. Therefore, the diachronic sequence of the texts are: Deut 1-3*, Deut 31:1-6, Deut 34:5a, Deut 4*, Num 20:12, Num 20:24, Num 27:12-14, Deut 32:48-52, and the last, Deut 34:4, 5b.

Several faults could be found in the actions and speech of Moses in the incident of the waters from the rock in Num 20:1-13. The sin of Moses was found in Num

20:10. The speaking itself was a sin or the rash words are faults. Moses' sin could also be found in Num 20:11. The lifting up of Moses' hand in Num 20:11 had both literary and symbolic meaning. Such symbolic meaning expressed that Moses deliberated to disobey YHWH's command. The raising of Moses' hand alluded to the "high hand" in Num 15:30-31. We also highlighted that the punishment of Moses in Num 20:1-13 was the removal of Moses' leadership rather than his exclusion. Such punishment was a kind of "cutting off" of Moses who disobeyed God deliberately. Num 20:24 was the first to re-interpret the sin of Moses as "rebellious against God's word" in the incident. When the redactors used the expression "rebellious against יהוה פי יהוה" to re-interpret the sin of Moses and Aaron, they wanted to signify that the rebellion of Moses and Aaron was a sin which contrasted with their usual obedience in the book of Numbers. Num 27:12-14 received that re-interpretation of the fault of Moses and rewrote it together with the sin of failing to regard God as holy.

According to the post-Priestly Pentateuch redaction of Deuteronomy in Deut 32:48-52, Moses was ordered to die because of the sin of failing to sanctify God. The exclusion of Moses was a natural consequence of his death outside the Promised Land. The punishment of the removal of the leadership of Moses in Num 20 was rewritten as a death punishment in Deut 32. Although the discussion of "sanctifying God" was very rare, we could still find that there are four ways to express the phrase "sanctifying God." It can mean manifesting God's power, awfulness, otherness, and

glory. However, the relational dimension of sanctifying God in Deut 32:48-52 signified obeying God's commands as a new way to understand the meaning of sanctifying God. The importance of sanctifying YHWH could be understood by His role as the sanctifier of the Israelites.

In Deut 31:2 and Deut 34:4-5, we saw that Gen 6:3 played an important role in the exclusion of Moses. Divine action was the main focus in Deut 31:1-6. The exclusion of Moses in Deut 31:2 could be seen as a result according to the two speaking actions of YHWH who set the time limit and spatial limit of Moses. The divine saying action of YHWH in Gen 6:3 set the limit on human life-span; while YHWH's saying action in Deut 31:2d set the limit of the space where Moses could live. There was a limit in both the space and time of Moses.

This perspective continued in Deut 34 which knew both the post-Priestly and the Deuteronomistic traditions, but it did not agree with them. Instead, Deut 34:7 explained that Moses was not allowed to enter the Promised Land because his life-span of 120 years had reached the end. Moses' death was caused by divine veto, not by divine anger or divine holiness.

Although Moses had “rebelled against יהוה פי” in the incident of waters from the rock, Deut 34:5 showed that Moses could continue his obedience to YHWH for he died על פי יהוה. Moses died because of the will of YHWH. Deut 34 seemed to construct Moses as a figure of identification for the Jews living in the Diaspora. The important thing was not to live in the Promised Land, but to live and to die according

to the will of YHWH.

Bibliography

- Abegg, Martin, Jr., Peter Flint, and Eugene Ulrich. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*. San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1999.
- Achenbach, Reinhard. *Die Vollendung der Tora: Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Numeribuches im Kontext von Hexateuch und Pentateuch*. BZAR 3. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2003.
- Albrektson, Betril. *History and the Gods: an Essay on the Idea of Historical Events as Divine Manifestations in the Ancient Near East and in Israel*. Lund: Gleerup, 1967.
- Angelini, Anna and Christophe Nihan “Holiness (Hebrew Bible/ Old Testament).” Pages 34-40 in vol. 12 of *Encyclopedia of the Bible and its Reception*. Edited by Hans-Josef Klauck. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009-.
- Artus, Olivier. *Etudes sur le livre des Nombres: Récit, Histoire et Loi en Nb 13,1-20,13*. OBO 157. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997.
- Ashley, Timothy R. *The Book of Numbers*. NICOT. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1993.
- Auld, A. Graeme. *Joshua Retold: Synoptic Perspectives*. OTS. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.
- . *Samuel at the Threshold: Selected Works of Graeme Auld*. SOTSMS. Burlington, Vt.: Ashgate, 2004.
- Baden, Joel S. *The Composition of the Pentateuch: Renewing the Documentary Hypothesis*. New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2012.
- Baentsch, B. *Exodus Leviticus und Numeri*. HKAT 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903.
- Baloian, Bruce Edward. *Anger in the Old Testament*. New York: Peter Lang, 1992.
- Barr, Jame. “Semantics and Biblical Theology: a contribution to the Discussion.” Pages 11-19 in *Congress Volume, Uppsala 1971*. Edited by P. A. H. de Boer. VTSup 22. Leiden: Brill, 1972.
- . “The Synchronic, the Diachronic and the Historical: A Triangular Relationship?” Pages 1-14 in *Synchronic or Diachronic? A Debate on Method in Old Testament Exegesis*. Edited by J. C. de Moor. OTS 34. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

- Barton, John. *The Nature of Biblical Criticism*. Louisville, Kent.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007.
- Begg, Christopher T. "The Literary Criticism of Deuteronomy 4,1-40: Contributions to a Continuing Discussion." *ETL* 56 (1980): 10-55.
- Bertholet, Alfred. *Deuteronomium*. KHCAT. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1899.
- . *Leviticus* KHCAT. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1901.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. "Deuteronomy." Pages 94-109 in *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Edited by R. E. Brown, J. A. Fitzmyer and R. E. Murphy. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1990.
- Block, Daniel I. *Deuteronomy*. NIVAC. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 2012.
- Blum, E. "Issues and Problems in the Contemporary Debate Regarding the Priestly Writings." Pages 31-44 in *The Strate of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions*. Edited by S. Shectman and J. S. Baden. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2009.
- . "Pentateuch-Hexateuch-Enneateuch? Or: How Can One Recognize a Literary Work in the Hebrew Bible?" Pages 43-71 in *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, or Enneateuch?: Identifying Literary Works in Genesis through Kings*. Edited by T. B. Dozeman, T. Römer and K. Schmid. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.
- . *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*. BZAW 189. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990.
- Boorer, Suzanne. "Kaleidoscopic Patterns and the Shaping of Experience." Pages 199-216 in *The Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty-First Century*. Edited by M. A. Sweeney and E. B. Zvi. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2003.
- . *The Promise of the Land as Oath: A Key to the Formation of the Pentateuch*. BZAW 205. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1992.
- Botterweck, G. Johannes, Helmer Ringgren, John T. Willis, and Heinz-Josef Fabry, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Translated by David E. Green and Douglas W. Stoot. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1974-.
- Braulik, Gerog. *Deuteronomium 1: Kapitel 1:1-16:17*. NEB 15. Würzburg: Echter, 1986.
- . *Deuteronomium 2: Kapitel 16:18-34:12*. NEB 28. Würzburg: Echter, 1992.

- . *Die Mittel deuteronomischer Rhetorik: Erhoben aus Deuteronomium 4, 1-40*. AnBib 68. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978.
- Brettler, Marc Zvi. "The Canonization of the Bible." Pages 2153-8 in *The Jewish Study Bible*. Edited by A. Berlin and M. Z. Brettler. 2d ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- British Library, *Codex Sinaiticus*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishing Co., 2010.
- Brueggemann, Walter. *Deuteronomy*. AOTC. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 2001.
- Budd, Philip J. "Holiness and Cult." Pages 275-298 in *The World of Ancient Israel: Sociological, Anthropological and Political Perspectives: Essays*. Edited by R. E. Clements. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- . *Leviticus: Based on the New Revised Standard Version*. NCBC. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1996.
- . *Numbers*. WBC 5. Waco, Tex.: Word, 1984.
- Buis, P. *Le Deutéronome*. Paris: Beauchesne, 1969.
- Buis, P. and J. Leclercq. *Le Deutéronome*. SB. Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1963.
- Bultmann, Christoph. "Deuteronomy." Pages 187-219 in *The Oxford Bible Commentary: The Pentateuch*. Edited by J. Barton et al. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Cairns, Ian. *Word and Presence: A Commentary on the Book of Deuteronomy*. ITC. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1992.
- Carr, David M. "Changes in Pentateuchal Criticism." Pages 433-466 in *The Twentieth Century – From Modernism to Post-Modernism* Vol. III/2 of *Hebrew Bible/ Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*. Edited by M. Sæbø. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015.
- Cazelles, Henri. "Passages in the Singular within Discourse in the Plural of DT 1-4." *CBQ* 29 (1967): 207-219.
- Childs, Brevard S. *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*. London: SCM, 1979.
- Christensen, Duane L. *Deuteronomy 1-11*. WBC 6A. Dallas, Tex.: Word Books, 1991.
- . *Deuteronomy 1:1-21:9*. WBC 6A. Nashville, Tenn.: Thomas Nelson, 2001.

- . *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12*. WBC 6B. Nashville, Tenn.: Thomas Nelson, 2002.
- . ed. *A Song of Power and the Power of Song: Essays on the Book of Deuteronomy*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1993.
- Clements, R. E. “The Book of Deuteronomy.” Pages 269-538 in vol. 2 of *The New Interpreter’s Bible*. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 1998.
- . *Deuteronomy*. Old Testament Guides. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
- Clines, David J. A., ed. *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. 8 vols. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993-2011.
- Coats, George W. *Rebellion in the Wilderness: The Murmuring Motif in the Wilderness Traditions of the Old Testament*. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 1968.
- Colenso, John William. *The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua Critically Examined*. London: Longmans Green and Co, 1878.
- Collins, John J. *The Invention of Judaism: Torah and Jewish identity from Deuteronomy to Paul*. Oakland, Calif.: University of California Press, 2017.
- Crawford, Sidnie White. “Reading Deuteronomy in the Second Temple Period.” Pages 127-140 in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library. The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretations*. Edited by K. de Troyer and A. Lange. Atlanta: SBL, 2005.
- . “Textual criticism of the book of Deuteronomy and the Oxford Hebrew Bible project.” Pages 315-326 in *Seeking out the Wisdom of the Ancients: Essays offered to honor Michael V. Fox on the Occasion of his sixty-fifth Birthday*. Edited by R. L. Troxel, K. G. Friebe, and D. R. Magary. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2005.
- Crawford, Sidnie White, Jan Joosten, and Eugene Charles Ulrich. “Sample editions of the Oxford Hebrew Bible: Deuteronomy 32:1-9, 1 Kings 11:1-8, and Jeremiah 27:1-10 (34 G).” *VT* 58 (2008): 352-366.
- Craigie, Peter C. *The Book of Deuteronomy*. NICOT. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1976.
- Cross, Frank Moore. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- Cunliffe-Jones, Hubert. *Deuteronomy*. New York: Macmillan, 1951.

- Dacan, J. A. "Deuteronomy, Book of." Pages 198-220 in vol.1 of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Dahlberg, B. T. "Wrath of God." Pages 903-908 in vol. 4 of *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Edited by G. A. Buttrick. 4 vols. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 1962.
- Davies, Eryl W. *Numbers*. NCBC. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Davies, Philip R., Diana V. Edelman, Christophe Nihan, and Thomas Römer, *Opening the Books of Moses*. Sheffield: Equinox, 2012.
- Dietrich, Walter. "Historiography in the Old Testament." in Pages 467-499 in *The Twentieth Century – From Modernism to Post-Modernism* Vol. III/2 of *Hebrew Bible/ Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*. Edited by Magne Sæbø. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015.
- Dillmann, August. *Die Bücher Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua*. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1886.
- Dogniez, Cécile, and Marguerite Harl. *La Bible D'Alexandrie. Le Deutéronome*. Paris: Cerf, 1992.
- Dorival, Gilles. *La Bible D'Alexandrie. Les Nombres*. Paris: Cerf, 1994.
- Dozeman, Thomas B. "The Book of Numbers." Pages 1-268 in vol. 2 of *The New Interpreter's Bible*. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 1998.
- . "The Holiness of God in Contemporary Jewish and Christian Biblical Theology." Pages 24-36 in *God's Word for Our World, Vol.2: Theological and Cultural Studies in Honor of Simon John De Vries*. Edited by J. Harold Ellens et al. London: T&T Clark International, 2004.
- . *The Pentateuch: Introducing the Torah*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2017.
- Dozeman, Thomas B., and Konrad Schmid, eds. *A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation*. SBLSymS 34. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
- Dozeman, Thomas B., Thomas Römer and Konrad Schmid, eds. *Pentateuch, Hexateuch or Enneateuch? Identifying Literary Works in Genesis through Kings*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.
- Dozeman, Thomas B., Konrad Schmid and Baruch J. Schwartz, eds. *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research*. FAT 78. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.

- Driver, S R. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1895.
- . *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*. 9th ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1913.
- Eichrodt, Walther. *Theology of the Old Testament*. Translated by John Baker. OTL. 2 vols. London: SCM Press, 1961-67.
- Eliade, Mircea. *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion*. Translated by Willard R. Trask. New York: Harcourt, 1959.
- Elliott-Binns, Leonard Elliott. *The Book of Numbers: with Introduction and Notes*. Westminster Commentaries. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1927.
- Finsterbusch, Karin. *Deuteronomium: Eine Einführung*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012.
- Fohrer, Georg. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. Translated by David E. Green. New York: Abingdon, 1968.
- Fox, Nili S. "Numbers." Pages 267-338 in *The Jewish Study Bible*. Edited by A. Berlin and M. Z. Brettler. 2d ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Frankel, David. *The Murmuring Stories of the Priestly School: A Retrieval of Ancient Sacerdotal Lore*. VTSup 89. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Freedman, David N., Astrid B. Beck and James A. Sanders, eds., *The Leningrad Codex: a facsimile edition*. Grand Rapids, Mich.; Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Friedman, Richard E. *The Bible with Source Revealed*. New York: Harper One, 2003.
- Frolov, Serge. "The Death of Moses and the Fate of Source Criticism." *JBL* 133 (2014): 648-660.
- Gammie, John G. *Holiness in Israel*. OBT. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.
- Gane, Roy. *Leviticus, Numbers*. NIVAC. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 2004.
- Gerstenberger, Erhard. *Leviticus: A Commentary*. Translated by Douglas W. Stott. OTL. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996.
- Gertz, Jan Christian. "Kompositorische Funktion und literarhistorischer Ort von Deuteronomium 1-3." Pages 103-123 in *Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke: Redaktions- und religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur "Deuteronomismus"-Diskussion in Tora und Vorderen Propheten*. Edited by M.

- Witte, K. Schmid, D. Prechel, and J. C. Gertz. BZAW 365. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2006.
- Gertz, Jan C., Angelika Berlejung, Konrad Schmid, and Markus Witte. *T&T Clark Handbook of the Old Testament*. Translated by Thomas Riplinger, P. Altmann and J. Adams-Maßmann. London: T&T Clark, 2012.
- Gibson, J. C. L. *Davidson's Introductory Hebrew Grammar: Syntax*. 4th ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.
- Goldin, Judah. "The Death of Moses: An Exercise in Midrashic Transposition." Pages 219-25 in *Love and Death in the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of Marvin H. Pope*. Edited by R. M. Good and J. H. Marks. Guilford, Conn.: Four Quarters, 1987.
- Goldingay, John. *Old Testament Theology*. 3 vols. Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter Varsity Press, 2003-2009.
- Gorman, Frank H. *Divine Presence and Community: A Commentary on the Book of Leviticus*. ITC. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Grant, Deena E. *Divine Anger in the Hebrew Bible*. CBQMS 52. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2014.
- Gray, George Buchanan. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Numbers*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1903.
- Griffits, J. S. *The Problem of Deuteronomy*. London: SPCK, 1911.
- Gwilym H. Jones, *1 and 2 Kings*. 2 vols. NCBC. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1984.
- Hanson, Anthony T. *The Wrath of The Lamb*. London: SPCK, 1957.
- Hartley, John E. *Leviticus*. WBC 4. Dallas, Texas: Word Books, 1992.
- Harvey, P. B. Jr. and B. Halpern. "W. M. L. de Wette's 'Dissertatio Critica...': Context and Translation." *ZABR* 14 (2008): 47-85.
- Herbert M. Haney, *The Wrath of God in the Former Prophets*. New York: Vantage Press, 1960.
- Herion, Gray A. "Wrath of God." Pages 989-996 in vol. 6 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by D. N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Hölscher, Gustav. "Komposition und Ursprung des Deuteronomiums." *ZAW* 40 (1922): 161-225.

- Jenni, Ernst, and Claus Westermann, eds. *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Translated by Mark Biddle. 3 vols. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1997.
- Jenson, Philip Peter. *Graded Holiness: A Key to the Priestly Conception of the World*. JSOTSup 106. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.
- . “Holiness in the Priestly Writings of the Old Testament.” Pages 93-121 in *Holiness: Past and Present*. Edited by S. C. Barton. London: T&T Clark International, 2003.
- Jeremias, Jörg. *Der Zorn Gottes im Alten Testament: Das biblische Israel zwischen Verwerfung und Erwählung*. 2d ed. BTS 104. Göttingen: Neukirchener, 2011.
- Joo, Samantha. *Provocation and punishment: the Anger of God in the Book of Jeremiah and Deuteronomistic Theology*. BZAW 361. Berlin; New York: de Gruyter, 2006.
- Junker, Hubert. *Deuteronomium*. Würzburg: Echter, 1952.
- Kaiser, Otto. *Introduction to the Old Testament: A Presentation of its Results and Problems*. Translated by J. Sturdy. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1975.
- Kapelrud, “How Tradition failed Moses.” *JBL* 76 (1957): 242
- Kilpatrick, T. B. “Anger (Wrath) of God.” Pages 477-482 in vol. 1 of *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*. Edited by J. Hastings. 13 vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1908.
- Kissling, Paul J. *Reliable Characters in the Primary History: Profiles of Moses, Joshua, Elijah and Elisha*. JSOTSup 224. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Kittel, G., and G. Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Translated by G. W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-1976.
- Klein, Ralph W. *Israel in Exile: A Theological Interpretation*. Philadelphia, PA.: Fortress, 1979.
- König, Eduard. *Das Deuteronomium: eingeleitet, übersetzt und erklärt von Eduard König*. KAT 3. Leipzig : A. Deichert, 1917.
- Knapp, Dietrich. *Deuteronomium 4: Literarische Analyse und theologische Interpretation*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987.
- Knierim, Rolf P. and George W. Coats, *Numbers*. FOTL 4. Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Knohl, Israel. “The Priestly Torah versus the Holiness School: Ideological Aspects.” Pages 51-57 in vol. 1 of *Proceedings of the Tenth World Congress of Jewish*

- Studies: Jerusalem, August 16-24, 1989.* Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1990.
- . *The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School.* Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.
- . “Two Aspects of the ‘Tent of Meeting’.” Pages 73-79 in *Tehillah le Moshe: Biblical and Judaic Studies in Honor of Moshe Greenberg*. Edited by M. Cogan et al. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1997.
- . “Who Edited the Pentateuch?” Pages 359-367 in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research*. Edited by T. B. Dozeman, K. Schmid and B. J. Schwartz. FAT 78. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- Knoppers, Gary N. “Cutheans or Children of Jacob? The Issue of Samaritan Origins in 2 Kings 17.” Pages 223-39 in *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld*. Edited by R. Rezetko, T. H. Lim, and W. B. Aucker. VTSup 113. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- . “Rethinking the Relationship between Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History: The Case of Kings.” *CBQ* 63 (2001): 393-415.
- . “Theories of the Redaction(s) of Kings.” Pages 69-88 in *The Books of Kings: Sources, Composition, Historiography and Reception*. Edited by A. Lemaire and B. Halpern. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010.
- Köckert, Matthias. “Die Entstehung des Bilderverbots.” Pages 272-290 in *Die Welt der Götterbilder*. Edited by B. Groneberg and H. Spieckermann. BZAW 376. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2007.
- Koehler, L., W. Baumgartner, and J. J. Stamm. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Translated and edited under the supervision of M. E. J. Richardson. Study Edition. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Kornfeld, Walter. *Levitikus*. NEB 6. Würzburg: Echter, 1983.
- Kratz, Reinhard G. *The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament*. Translated by John Bowden. New York: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Kuenen, Abraham. *An Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch: Vol. 1*. Translated by P. H. Wicksteed. London: Macmillan, 1886.
- Labuschagne, C. J. “The Meaning of b^eyād rāmā in the Old Testament.” Pages 143-148 in *Von Kanaan bis Kerala. FS J. P. M. van der Ploeg*. Edited by W. S. Delsman et al. AOAT 211. Kevelaer, 1982.

- Latvus, Kari. *God, Anger and Ideology: The Anger of God in Joshua and Judges in Relation to Deuteronomy and the Priestly Writings*. JSOTSup 279. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Lee, Won. "The Exclusion of Moses from the Promised Land: A Conceptual Approach." Pages 217-239 in *Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty-first Century*. Edited by M. A. Sweeney and E. B. Zvi. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Levenson, Jon D. "Who Inserted the Book of the Torah?" *HTR* 68 (1975): 203-233.
- Levine, Baruch A. "The Language of Holiness: Perceptions of the Sacred in the Hebrew Bible." Pages 241-255 in *Background for the Bible*. Edited by M. P. O'Connor and D. N. Freedman. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1987.
- . *Leviticus: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation*. JPSTC. New York: Jewish Publication Society, 1989.
- . *Numbers 1-20: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 4. New York: Doubleday, 1993.
- . *Numbers 21-36: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 4A. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- Levinson, Bernard M. "Deuteronomy." Pages 356-450 in *The Jewish Study Bible*. Edited by A. Berlin and M. Z. Brettler. 2d ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- L'Heureux, Conrad E. "Numbers." Pages 80-93 in *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Edited by R. E. Brown et al. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1990.
- Lim, Johnson Teng Kok. *The Sin of Moses and the Staff of God: A Narrative Approach*. Assen, Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1997.
- . "The Sin of Moses in Deuteronomy." *AJT* 17 (2003): 250-266.
- Lim, Timothy H. "Deuteronomy in the Judaism of the Second Temple Period." Pages 6-26 in *Deuteronomy in the New Testament*. Edited by M. J. J. Menken and S. Moyise. London: Continuum, 2007.
- . *The Formation of the Jewish Canon*. AYBRL. New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2013.
- Lindars, Barnabas. "Ezekiel and Individual Responsibility." *VT* 15 (1965): 452-467.
- Lohfink, Norbert. "Canonical Signals in the Additions in Deuteronomy 1.39." Pages 30-43 in *Seeing Signals, Reading Signs*. Edited by M. A. O'Brien and H. N. Wallace. JSOTSup 415. London: T&T Clark, 2004.

- . “Darstellungskunst und Theologie in Dtn 1,6-3,29.” *Bib* 41(1960): 105-134.
- . “Deuteronomy.” Pages 229-232 in Supplementary vol. of *The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible*. Edited by K. Crim. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 1976.
- . *Studien zum Deuteronomium und zur deuteronomistischen Literatur V*. SBAB 38. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk GmbH, 2005.
- . *Theology of the Pentateuch: Themes of the Priestly Narrative and Deuteronomy*. Translated by L. M. Maloney. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.
- . “Der Zorn Gottes und das Exil. Beobachtungen am deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk.” Pages 137-155 in *Liebe und Gebot: FS L. Perlitt*. Edited by R. G. Kratz et al. FRLANT 190. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000. Repr. pages 37-55 in *Studien zum Deuteronomium und zur deuteronomistischen Literatur V*. SBAB 38. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2005.
- López, Félix García. “Deut 34, Dtr History and the Pentateuch.” Pages 47-61 in *Studies in Deuteronomy: In Honour of C. J. Labuschagne on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*. Edited by F. G. Martínez, A. Hilhorst, J. T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, and A. S. van der Woude. VTSup 53. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Lundom, Jack R. *Deuteronomy: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2013.
- Lust, Johan. “Exile and Diaspora: Gathering from Dispersion in Ezekiel.” Pages 99-122 in *Lectures et Relectures de la Bible: Festschrift P.-M. Bogaert*. Edited by J.-M. Auwers and A. Wénin. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999.
- Lux, Rüdiger. “Der Tod des Mose als »besprochene und erzählte Welt«.” *ZThK* 84 (1987): 395-425.
- MacDonald, Nathan. “The Literary Criticism and Rhetorical Logic of Deuteronomy I-IV.” *VT* 56 (2006): 203-224.
- Martínez, F. García. “Les manuscrits du désert de Juda et le Deutéronome.” Pages 63-82 in *Studies in Deuteronomy: in Honour of C. J. Labuschagne on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*. Edited by F. G. Martínez et al. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Matthew, Victor H. *Judges and Ruth*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Mann, Thomas W. “Theological Reflections on the Denial of Moses.” *JBL* 98 (1979): 481-494.

- Marx, Alfred. *Lévitique 17-27*. CAT IIIb. Genève: Labor et Fides, 2011.
- Mathys, H. P. "Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wettes *Dissertatio critico-exegetica* von 1805." Pages 171-211 in *Biblische Theologie und historisches Denken: Wissenschaftsgeschichtliche Studien*. Edited by M. Keßler and M. Wallraf. Basel: Schwabe, 2008.
- Mayes, A. D. H. *Deuteronomy*. NCBC. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1979.
- . "Deuteronomy 4 and the Literary Criticism of Deuteronomy." *JBL* 100 (1981): 23-51.
- . *The Story of Israel between Settlement and Exile*. London: SCM, 1983.
- Mays, J. L. *Leviticus, Numbers*. LBC. London: SCM Press, 1964.
- McCarthy, Carmel., ed. *Deuteronomy. Biblia Hebraica Quinta Fascicle 5*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007.
- McCarthy, Dennis J. "The Wrath of Yahweh and the Structural Unity of the Deuteronomistic History." Pages 99-110 in *Essays in Old Testament Ethics: J Philip Hyatt, in Memoriam*. Edited by J. L. Crenshaw and J. T. Willis. New York: Ktav Pub. House, 1974.
- McConville, J. Gordon. *Deuteronomy*. AOTC. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2002.
- McKenzie, Steven L. "Kings (Books)." Pages 303-306 in vol. 15 of *Encyclopedia of the Bible and its Reception*. Edited by Hans-Josef Klauck. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009-.
- . *The Trouble with Kings: the Composition of the book of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History*. VTSup 42. Leiden: Brill, 1991.
- McNeile, A. H. *The Book of Numbers*. CBSC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911.
- Milgrom, Jacob. *Cult and Conscience*. Leiden: Brill, 1976.
- . *Leviticus 1-16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 3. New York: Doubleday, 1991.
- . *Leviticus 17-22: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 3A. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- . "Magic, Monotheism and the Sin of Moses." Pages 251-265 in *The Quest for the Kingdom of God: Studies in honor of George E. Mendenhall*. Edited by H. B. Huffmon et al. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1983.

- . *Numbers. The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation*. JPSTC. Philadelphia, PA.: Jewish Publication Society, 1989.
- Miller, J. Maxwell and John H. Hayes. *A History of Ancient Israel and Judah*. 2d ed. Louisville, Kent.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006.
- Miller, Patrick D. *Deuteronomy*. Interpretation. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster; John Knox, 1990.
- Mittmann, Siegfried. *Deuteronomium 1,1-6,3: Literarkritisch und Traditionsgeschichtlich Untersucht*. BZAW 139. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1975.
- Moran, William L. "Deuteronomy." Pages 256-276 in *A New Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture*. Edited by R. C. Fuller et al. London: Nelson, 1969.
- Nelson, Richard. *Deuteronomy: A Commentary*. OTL. Louisville; London: Westminster John Knox, 2002.
- . *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History*. JSOTSup 18. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981.
- Nicholson, Ernest W. *Deuteronomy and Tradition*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967.
- Nielsen, Eduard. *Deuteronomium*. HKAT 6. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1995.
- Nihan, Christophe. *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch: A Study in the Composition of the Book of Leviticus*. FAT 2/25. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- . "La mort de Moïse (Nb 20,1-13; 20,22-29; 27,12-23) et l'édition finale du livre des Nombres" Pages 145-182 in *Les dernières rédactions du Pentateuque, de l'Hexateuque et de l'Ennéateuque*. Edited by T. Römer and K. Schmid. BETHL 203. Leuven: Peeters, 2007.
- Nihan, Christophe and Thomas Römer, "Le débat actuel sur la formation du Pentateuque." Pages 165-175 in *Introduction à l'Ancien Testament*. Edited by T. Römer, J.-D. Macchi and C. Nihan. 2d ed. Genève: Labor et Fides, 2009.
- Nöldeke, Theodor. *Untersuchungen zur Kritik des Alten Testaments*. Kiel: Schwerts'sche Buchhandlung, 1869.
- Noth, Martin. *The Chronicler's History*. Translated by H. G. M. Williamson. JSOTSup 50. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987. Translation of *Überlieferungsgeschichte Studien, Teil 2*. 2d ed. Halle: Niemeyer, 1957.
- . *The Deuteronomistic History*. Translated by J. Doull and J. Barton. JSOTSup 15. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1981; 2d ed. 1991. Translation of pages 1-110 of *Überlieferungsgeschichte Studien: Die*

- sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament*. 2d ed. Halle: Niemeyer, 1957.
- . *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions*. Translated by B. W. Anderson. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972. Translation of *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch*. 2d ed. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1948.
- . *Leviticus: A Commentary*. Translated by J. E. Anderson. OTL. London: SCM Press, 1965.
- . *Numbers: A Commentary*. Translated by J. Martin. OTL. London: SCM Press, 1968.
- Olson, Dennis T. "Caleb." Pages 779-81 in vol. 4 of *Encyclopedia of the Bible and its Reception*. Edited by Hans-Josef Klauck. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009-.
- . *The Death of the Old and the Birth of the New: The Framework of the Book of Numbers and the Pentateuch*. BJS 71. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1985.
- . "Deuteronomy." Pages 653-8 in vol. 6 of *Encyclopedia of the Bible and its Reception*. Edited by Hans-Josef Klauck. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009-.
- . *Deuteronomy and the Death of Moses: A Theological Reading*. OBT. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1994.
- . *Numbers*. Interpretation. Louisville, Ky.: John Knox Press, 1996.
- Orr, J. "Anger (Wrath) of God." Pages 97-99 in vol.1 of *A Dictionary of the Bible*. Edited by J. Hastings. 5 vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1898.
- Otto, Eckart. *Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und Hexateuch: Studien zur Literaturgeschichte von Pentateuch und Hexateuch im Lichte des Deuteronomiumrahmens*. FAT 30. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- . *Deuteronomium 1,1-4,43*. HTKAT. Freiburg: Herder, 2012.
- . *Deuteronomium 23,16-34,12*. HTKAT. Freiburg: Herder, 2017.
- . "Deuteronomy." Pages 786-8 in vol. 3 of *Religion Past and Present*. Edited by H. D. Betz, D. S. Browning, B. Janowski and E. Jüngel. 14 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2005-2013.
- . "Deuteronomy Between the Pentateuch and the Deuteronomistic History: Some Remarks about Thomas Römer, *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History*." *JHS* 9 (2009): 22-27.
- . "The Integration of the Post-Exilic Book of Deuteronomy into the Post-Priestly Pentateuch." Pages 331-341 in *The Post-Priestly Pentateuch: New*

- Perspectives on its Redactional Development and Theological Profiles*. Edited by F. Giuntoli and K. Schmid. FAT 101. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015.
- . “Pentateuch.” Pages 682-90 in vol. 9 of *Religion Past and Present*. Edited by H. D. Betz, D. S. Browning, B. Janowski and E. Jüngel. 14 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2005-2013.
- . “The Pentateuch Between Synchrony and Diachrony: Perspectives for the Encounter between Africa and Europe.” Pages 22-49 in *A Critical Study of the Pentateuch: An Encounter between Europe and Africa*. Edited by E. Otto and J. LeRoux. ATM 20. Münster: LIT, 2005.
- . “The Pentateuch in Synchronical and Diachronical Perspectives: Protorabbinic Scribal Erudition Mediating Between Deuteronomy and the Priestly Code.” Pages 14-35 in *Das Deuteronomium zwischen Pentateuch und Deuteronomistischem Geschichtswerk*. Edited by R. Achenbach and E. Otto. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004.
- . “The Pivotal Meaning of Pentateuch Research for a History of Israelite and Jewish Religion and Society.” Pages 29-53 in *South African Perspectives on the Pentateuch between Synchrony and Diachrony*. Edited by E. Otto and J. LeRoux. London; New York: T&T Clark International, 2007.
- Otto, Rudolf. *The Idea of Holy: An Inquiry into the Non-rational Factor in the Idea of the Divine and its Relation to the Rational*. Translated by John W. Harvey. 2d ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1950.
- Perlitt, Lothar. *Deuteronomium (1-6*)*. BKAT 5. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2013.
- . “Priesterschrift im Deuteronomium?” *ZAW* 100 Supplement (1988): 65-88.
- Phillips, A. *Deuteronomy*. CBC. Cambridge: Cambridge, 1973.
- Pietersma, Albert, and Benjamin G. Wright, eds. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint: And the other Greek Translations Traditionally included under that Title*. New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Pitkänen, Pekka. *A Commentary on Numbers: Narrative, Ritual, and Colonialism*. Routledge Studies in the Biblical World. London; New York: Routledge, 2017.
- Pola, Thomas, *Die ursprüngliche Priesterschrift: Beobachtungen zur Literarkritik und Traditionsgeschichte von Pg.WMANT 70*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1995.
- Polzin, Robert. *Moses and the Deuteronomist*. New York: Seabury, 1980. Repr., Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1993.

- Preuss, Horst Dietrich. *Deuteronomium*. Erträge der Forschung 164. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1982.
- . *Old Testament Theology*. Translated by Leo G. Perdue. OTL. 2 vols. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995.
- Porter, J. R. *Leviticus*. CBC. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- Propp, William Henry. “The Rod of Aaron and the Sin of Moses.” *JBL* 107 (1988): 19-26.
- . *Water in the Wilderness*. HSM 40. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1987.
- . “Why Moses Could Not Enter The Promised Land.” *BR* 14 (1998): 36-43.
- Pury, Albert de, Thomas Römer and Jean-Daniel Macchi, eds., *Israel Constructs its History: Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research*. JSOTSup 306. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Rad, Gerhard von. *Deuteronomy*. Translated by Dorothea Barton. OTL. London: SCM Press, 1966.
- . *Studies in Deuteronomy*. Translated by David Stalker. London: SCM Press, 1953.
- Ramban (Nachmanides). *Commentary to the Torah: Deuteronomy*. Translated by C. B. Chavel. New York: Shilo Publishing House, 1976.
- Rashi, *The Pentateuch and Rashi's commentary: Deuteronomy*. Edited by A.B. Isaiah and B. Sharfman. New York: S & S R Publishing Company, 1949.
- Rendtorff, Rolf. *The Problem of the Process of Transmission in the Pentateuch*. Translated by J. J. Scullion. JSOTSup 89. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990. Translation of *Das überlieferungsgeschichtliche Problem des Pentateuch*. BZAW 147. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1977.
- Ritschl, Albrecht. *Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung, Vol. II*. Bonn: Adolph Marcus, 1874; 3d ed. 1889.
- Rofé, Alexander. *Deuteronomy: Issues and Interpretation*. OTS. Edited by D. J. Reimer. London; New York: T&T Clark, 2002.
- . *Introduction to the Composition of the Pentateuch*. Translated by Harvey N. Bock. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

- Rogerson, John. *W. M. L. de Wette Founder of Modern Biblical Criticism: An Intellectual Biography*. JSOTSup 126. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.
- . “What is Holiness?” Pages 3-21 in *Holiness: Past and Present*. Edited by S. C. Barton. London: T&T Clark International, 2003.
- Römer, Thomas. “The Book of Deuteronomy.” Pages 178-212 in *The History of Israel’s Tradition: The Heritage of Martin Noth*. Edited by S. McKenzie and M. Graham. JSOTSup 182. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- . “Deuteronomistic History.” Pages 648-53 in vol. 6 of *Encyclopedia of the Bible and its Reception*. Edited by Hans-Josef Klauck. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009-.
- . “Das deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk und die Wüstentraktionen der Hebräischen Bibel.” Pages 55-88 in *Das deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk*. Edited by H.-J. Stipp. ÖBS 39. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2011.
- . “The Date, Composition and Function of Joshua 24 in Recent Research.” *HeBAI* (2017): 203-216.
- . “‘Higher Criticism’: The Historical and Literary-critical Approach – with Special Reference to the Pentateuch.” Pages 393-423 in *Hebrew Bible/ Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation Vol. III/1 From Modernism to Post-Modernism, The Nineteenth Century – a Century of Modernism and Historicism*. Edited by M. Sæbø. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013.
- . “Israel’s Sojourn in the Wilderness and the Conclusion of the Book of Numbers.” Pages 419-445 in *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld*. Edited by R. Rezetko, T. H. Lim, and W. B. Aucker. VTSup 113. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- . *Israels Väter: Untersuchungen zur Väterthematik im Deuteronomium und in der deuteronomistischen Tradition*. OBO 99. Fribourg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990.
- . *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical and Literary Introduction*. New York: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Römer, Thomas C. and Marc Z. Brettler. “Deuteronomy 34 and the Case for a Persian Hexateuch.” *JBL* 119 (2000): 401-19.
- Rose, Martin. *Deuteronomist und Jahwist: Untersuchungen zu den Berührungspunkten beider Literaturwerke*. AThANT 67. Zürich: Theologischer, 1981.

- . “Empoigner le Pentateuque par sa fin!: L’investiture de Josué et la mort de Moïse.” Pages 129-147 in *Le Pentateuque en question*. Edited by A. de Pury and T. Römer. Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1989. 3d ed 2002.
- . *5. Mose Teilban 2: 5. Mose 1-11 und 26-34*. ZBAT 5. Zurich: Theologischer, 1994.
- Sakenfeld, Katharine Doob. “Theological and Redactional Problems in Numbers 20:2-13.” Pages 133-154 in *Understanding the Word*. Edited by S. V. F. Butler. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985.
- Scharbert, J. *Numeri*. NEB 27. Würzburg: Echter, 1992.
- Schmid, Konrad. “The Late Persian Formation of the Torah: Observations on Deuteronomy 34.” Pages 237-251 in *Judah and the Judeans in the fourth Century B.C.E.* Edited by O. Lipschits, G. N. Knoppers, and R. Albertz. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2007.
- Schmid, Konrad., and Raymond F. Person Jr., eds. *Deuteronomy in the Pentateuch, Hexateuch, and the Deuteronomistic History*. FAT 2/56. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.
- Schmidt, Ludwig Von. “Die Kundschaftererzählung in Num 13-14 und Dtn 1,19-46: eine Kritik neuerer Pentateuchkritik.” *ZAW* 114 (2002): 40-58.
- . “P in Deuteronomium 34.” *VT* 59 (2009): 475-494.
- . “Die Priesterschrift --- kein Ende am Sinai!” *ZAW* 120 (2008): 481-499.
- . *Das vierte Buch Mose Numeri 10,11-36,13*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004.
- Schmitt, Hans-Christoph. “Spätdeuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk und Priesterschrift in Deuteronomium 34.” Pages 407-424 in *Textarbeit: Studien zu Texten und ihrer Rezeption aus dem Alten Testament und der Umwelt Israels : Festschrift für Peter Weimar zur Vollendung seines 60.* Edited by K. Kiesow and T. Meurer. Münster: Ugarit, 2003.
- Schwartz, Baruch J. “Israel’s Holiness: The Torah Traditions.” Pages 50-59 in *Purity and Holiness: The Heritage of Leviticus*. Edited by M. J. H. M. Poorthuis and J. Schwartz. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . “Leviticus.” Pages 193-266 in *The Jewish Study Bible*. Edited by A. Berlin and M. Z. Brettler. 2d ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Seebass, Horst “Josua.” *BN* 28 (1985): 53-65.

- . *Numeri Kapitel 10,11-22,1*. BKAT 4. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2003.
- . *Numeri Kapitel 22,2-36,13*. BKAT 4. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2007.
- . *Numeri Kapitel 1,1-10,10*. BKAT 4. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2012.
- Shectman, Sarah and Joel S. Baden, eds. *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debates and Future Directions*. Zurich: Theologischer Verlag Zurich, 2009.
- Simpson, Cuthbert A. *The Early Traditions of Israel: A Critical Analysis of the Pre-deuteronomic Narrative of the Hexateuch*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1948.
- Ska, Jean-Louis. *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*. Translated by Sr. Pascale Dominique. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2006.
- . “Narrator or Narrators.” Pages 221-231 in *The Exegesis of the Pentateuch: Exegetical Studies and Basic Questions*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- Smend, Rudolf. “Wrath of God (OT).” Pages 810-811 in vol. 5 of *Encyclopedia of Christianity*. Edited by E. Fahlbusch et al. 5 vols. Grand Rapids, Mich.; Leiden: William B. Eerdmans; Brill, 1999-2005.
- Smith, George Adam. *The Book of Deuteronomy in the Revised Version with Introduction and Notes*. CBSC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1918.
- Snaith, Norman Henry. *Leviticus and Numbers*. CB. London: Nelson, 1971.
- Soggin, J. Alberto. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. Translated by John Bowden. 3d ed. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster; John Knox Press, 1989.
- Sonnet, Jean-Pierre. *The book within the book: Writing in Deuteronomy*. BIS 14. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- . “Le rendez-vous du Dieu vivant: La mort de Moïse dans l'intrigue du Deutéronome (Dt 1-4 et Dt 31-34).” *NRTh* 123 (2001): 353-372.
- . “Nb 20,11: Moïse en Flagrant Délit de « Main Levée »?” Pages 535-543 in *The Books of Leviticus and Numbers*. Edited by T. Römer. BETL 215. Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 2008.
- Specht, Herbert. “Die Verfehlung Moses und Aarons in Num 20,1-13*P.” Pages 273-313 in *Torah and the Book of Numbers*. Edited by C. Frevel, T. Pola and A. Schart. FAT 2/62. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

- Steuernagel, Carl. *Deuteronomium und Josua*. HKAT 3. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1900.
- . *Deuteronomium*. HKAT 3. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1923.
- Sturdy, John. *Numbers*. CBC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- Tawil, Hayim. *Crown of Aleppo: the Mystery of the oldest Hebrew Bible Codex*. Philadelphia, Pa.: Jewish Publication Society, 2010.
- Thompson, Edward M. ed., *Facsimile of the Codex Alexandrinus*. Vol.1. London: British Museum, 1881.
- Tidball, Derek. *The Message of Leviticus: Free to be Holy*. The Bible Speaks Today. Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 2005.
- Tigay, Jeffrey H. *Deuteronomy. The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation Commentary*. The JPS Torah Commentary. Philadelphia, PA.: Jewish Publication Society, 1996.
- Tov, Emanuel. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. 2d ed. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2001.
- Ulrich, Eugene C. ed., *The Biblical Qumran scrolls: transcriptions and textual variants*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- VanGemeren, Willem A., ed. *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology & Exegesis*. 4 vols. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan Pub. House, 1997.
- Van Seters, John. *The Life of Moses: the Yahwist as Historian in Exodus-Numbers*. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster; John Knox Press, 1994.
- de Vaulx, Jules. "Holy." Pages 236-39 in *Dictionary of Biblical Theology*. Edited by X. Léon-Dufour. 2d ed. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1973.
- . *Les Nombres*. SB. Paris: Gabalda, 1972.
- de Vaux, Roland. "The Settlement of the Israelites in Southern Palestine and the Origins of the Tribe of Judah." Pages 108-34 in *Translating and Understanding the Old Testament: Essays in Honor of Herbert Gordon May*. Edited by H. T. Frank and W. L. Reed. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 1970.
- Veijola, Timo. *Das fünfte Buch Mose Deuteronomium: Kapitel 1,1-16,17*. ATD 8,1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004.
- . "Principal Observations of the Basic Story in Deuteronomy 1-3." Pages 249-59 in *"Wünschet Jerusalem Frieden": IOSOT Congress, Jerusalem 1986*.

- Edited by M. Augustin and K.-D. Schunck. BEATAJ 13. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1988. Repr. pages 137-146 in *A Song of Power and the Power of Song*. Edited by D. L. Christensen. SBTS 3. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1993.
- Vrienze, T. C. and A. S. van der Woude, *Ancient Israelite and Early Jewish Literature*. Translated by B. Doyle. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2005.
- Waltke, Bruce K. and O'Connor M. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Webster, John. *Holiness*. London: SCM Press, 2003.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972. Repr., Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1992.
- . *Deuteronomy 1-11: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 5. New York: Doubleday, 1991.
- Welch, Adam C. *The Code of Deuteronomy*. London: James Clarke & Co., 1924.
- Wellhausen, Julius. *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*. 4th ed. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1963; originally published 1876-1878; 2d ed. 1889; 3d ed. 1899.
- . *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*. Translated by J. S. Black and A. Menzies. Edinburgh: Black, 1885.
- Wenham, Gordon J. *The Book of Leviticus*. NICOT. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1979.
- . *Numbers*. TOTC. Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1981.
- . *Numbers*. Old Testament Guides. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- . *The Pentateuch*. Exploring the Old Testament. Vol. 1. London: SPCK, 2003.
- Wette, Wilhelm Martin L. de. *Dissertatio critico-exegetica qua Deuteronomium a prioribus Pentateuchi libris diversum, alius cuiusdam recentioris auctoris opus esse monstratur*. Jean: Literis Etzdorfii, 1805.
- Wevers, John William. *Notes on the Greek text of Deuteronomy*. SCS 39. Atlanta, Geo: Scholars Press, 1995.
- . *Notes on the Greek text of Leviticus*. SCS 44. Atlanta, Geo: Scholars Press, 1997.

- . *Notes on the Greek text of Numbers*. SCS 46. Atlanta, Geo: Scholars Press, 1998.
- Wong, Ka Leung. “‘And Moses raised his hand’ in Numbers 20,11.” *Bib* 89 (2008): 397-400.
- . *The Idea of Retribution in the Book of Ezekiel*. VTSup 87. Leiden; Boston; Köln: Brill, 2001.
- . *Book of Numbers*. Hong Kong: Logos, 2008. (Chinese) 在曠野中與上帝同行: 民數記析讀. 聖經通識叢書. 初版 香港: 基道出版社, 2008.
- Wright, Christopher J H. *Deuteronomy*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1996.
- Wright, David P. “Holiness (OT).” Pages 237-49 in vol. 3 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by D. N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Wright, G. Ernest. “The Book of Deuteronomy.” Pages 307-537 in vol. 2 of *The Interpreter’s Bible*. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 1953.
- Wright, Jacob L. *David, King of Israel, and Caleb in Biblical Memory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Würthwein, Ernst. *The Text of the Old Testament: an Introduction to Biblia Hebraica*. Translated by E. F. Rhodes. 2d ed. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Yoo, Philip Y. “The Four Moses Death Accounts.” *JBL* 131 (2012): 423-441.
- . “The Place of Deuteronomy 34 and Source Criticism; A Response to Serge Frolov.” *JBL* 133 (2014): 661-668.
- Zenger, Erich and C. Frevel ed. *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. 8th ed. Kohlhammer Studienbücher Theologie 1/1. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2012.
- Zion Zevit, “Converging Lines of Evidence Bearing on the Date of P.” *ZAW* 94 (1982): 481-511.